DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 891 95 UD 015 413

TITLE	State Compensatory Education Programs.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DHEW-OE-75-07107
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	79p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($1.40)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; *Compensatory Education; *Compensatory Education Programs; Culturally Disadvantaged; Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Grades; Federal Aid; Federal Programs; Language Handicapped; Secondary Grades; State Aid; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

Nineteen states are covered in this report on state compensatory education programs, examining the status of state financed compensatory education programs established during the last decade through the passage of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Programs discussed are stated to be limited to those designed for elementary and secondary level children with educational disadvantages caused by economic, cultural, and/or linguistic problems; programs for mentally, physically, or emotionally handicapped children are not included. The discussion is stated not to follow a standard format, due to the differences in state guidelines requirements as to the type of data to be submitted. Among the states included in the ongoing programs section are California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and New York. Two other chapters examine expired programs and anticipated programs, with a final chapter providing a directory of persons responsible for each of the programs discussed in this report. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED--No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

DHEW Publication No. (OE) 75-07107

ED111891

STATE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 015413

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, *Secretary*
Virginia Y. Trotter, *Assistant Secretary for Education*
Office of Education
T.H. Bell, *Commissioner*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1975

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1.40

PREFACE

In the early 1960's a growing awareness of the educational disadvantages resulting from economic, cultural, and linguistic deprivation triggered the outbreak of a number of compensatory education programs at both the State and Federal levels. The Federal Government committed billions of dollars to education for the disadvantaged through such programs as Head Start, titles I, VII, and VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Upward Bound, and Follow Through.

This report examines the efforts of 19 States which also initiated their own compensatory education programs during the last decade. Fourteen States currently operate such programs; three States had compensatory education programs which have expired. Four States, one with an ongoing program and another with an expired program, have compensatory education programs which will go into effect by 1976.

The State compensatory education programs discussed in this report are limited to those designed for children with educational disadvantages caused by economic, cultural, and/or linguistic problems. Programs for mentally, physically, or emotionally handicapped children are not covered in this report. The report is also limited to elementary and secondary education programs (a few States also have higher education programs aimed at the disadvantaged).

CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. ONGOING PROGRAMS	11
California	11
Educationally Disadvantaged Youth Program	11
Bilingual Education Act	15
Other Components	17
Connecticut	18
Florida	22
Hawaii	23
Comprehensive School Alienation Program	23
Act 4	26
Act 299	26
Illinois	27
Louisiana	29
Maryland	31
Massachusetts	32
Michigan	34
Section 48	35
Section 3	35
Bilingual Education Program	37
New Jersey	38
New Mexico	38
New York	40
Ohio	42
Oregon	44
Pennsylvania	45
Rhode Island	48
Bilingual Education Program	49

Page

Texas 50

Utah. 52

Washington. 53
URRD. 53
Culturally Disadvantaged Program. 57

Wisconsin 57

3. EXPIRED PROGRAMS. 61

Colorado. 61

Delaware. 62

New York. 64

4. ANTICIPATED PROGRAMS. 65

Georgia 65

Maryland. 65

New York. 66

Virginia. 67

DIRECTORY 69

1. INTRODUCTION

In examining the history of compensatory education, it is difficult to determine whether the impetus for such programs was provided by the Federal Government--through Head Start, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and Follow Through--or by individual State and local educators. Several of the early State efforts in compensatory education--including California's McAteer Act and Hawaii's Special Motivation Program--preceded the passage of title I ESEA* by several years. However, the bulk of the State compensatory education programs followed title I and in many instances are modeled after the Federal program.

This report examines the status of State-financed compensatory education programs. Table 1 shows which States currently have such programs, had or never had such programs in the past, or anticipate funding statewide compensatory education efforts in the near future. Even such broad classifications are difficult to determine. For example, Florida is listed as having an ongoing program; the legislation remains on the book, but no appropriation was made for it in fiscal year 1974.

The definition of compensatory education varied among the States. Many States considered bilingual education programs as part of or as their entire compensatory education program. In those instances in which States provided information on their bilingual program such information was included in the text.

No two State-financed compensatory education programs are exactly alike. Several State programs limit participation to very precise categories of disadvantaged students, such as dropouts or children from non-English-speaking homes. Some State laws define disadvantaged children in terms of economic and/or cultural criteria; others use a definition based on achievement levels. The appropriation levels of the State programs also vary widely, as do their requirements for participation and eligibility.

The discussions of State compensatory education programs in this report do not follow any standard format. There are several reasons for this: State guidelines require different types of data to be submitted about programs--in some cases, little information is available; in others, a great deal of data is available. At least three of the ongoing State compensatory education programs did not begin operating until 1973; thus, little evaluative data are available on their success or failure.

---

*Title I ESEA will be referred to hereafter in the text simply as "title I."

Table 1. Status of State-Financed Compensatory Education Programs

State	Ongoing	Expired	Anticipated	Never Existed	Bilingual Education Program
Alabama				X	
Alaska				X	
Arizona				X	
Arkansas				X	
California	X				X
Colorado		X			
Connecticut	X				
Delaware		X			
District of Columbia				X	
Florida	X				
Georgia			X		
Hawaii	X				
Idaho				X	
Illinois	X				X
Indiana				X	
Iowa				X	
Kansas				X	
Kentucky				X	
Louisiana	X				X
Maine				X	
Maryland	X				
Massachusetts	X				X
Michigan	X				X
Minnesota				X	
Mississippi				X	
Missouri				X	
Montana				X	
Nebraska				X	
Nevada				X	
New Hampshire				X	
New Jersey					X
New Mexico	X				X
New York	X	X	X		X
North Carolina				X	
North Dakota				X	
Ohio	X				
Oklahoma				X	
Oregon	X				
Pennsylvania	X				X
Rhode Island	X				X
South Carolina				X	
South Dakota				X	

Table 1 (continued)

State	Ongoing	Expired	Anticipated	Never Existed	Bilingual Education Program
Tennessee				X	
Texas	X				X
Utah	X				
Vermont				X	
Virginia			X		
Washington	X				
West Virginia				X	
Wisconsin	X				
Wyoming				X	

Eleven States--Alaska*, California, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, and Texas--have legislation dealing solely with bilingual education. Six of the laws--those in Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Texas--make participation in the State bilingual program mandatory for school districts with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability. The size of the programs varies considerably; in 1974-75 Rhode Island has only $50,000 to implement its program, while Illinois, with the largest program, has nearly $8 million.

Three States--Colorado, Florida, and Oregon--are considering bilingual education laws. A bilingual education bill was introduced in the Colorado house in 1974, but the Senate passed a bill emphasizing reading as a major priority; as a compromise, the two legislative bodies agreed to conduct a statewide needs assessment during the 1974-75 school year before implementing any State-financed compensatory education program. Florida's State Department of Education has developed a position paper on bilingual education in response to growing legislative interest in the subject during the 1974 legislative session. A bill calling for $1 million to finance bilingual education projects was introduced in the Oregon legislature in January 1975; the bill calls for teacher training, development of bilingual education materials, and the establishment of demonstration programs in bilingual education.

In addition to such legislative packages, several States have bilingual education programs without specific legal mandates. Pennsylvania,

*At press time, information on the bilingual education program from the State of Alaska had not been received.

discussed in detail later, is the best example of this, with a program serving more than 12,000 children. The State mandated bilingual education on the basis of a directive from the Secretary of Education; funding comes out of local tax levies. Maine also has a small bilingual project in Sinclair (Arista County) financed with funds for Schools for Children in Unorganized Territories.

An important source of funding for bilingual education is general compensatory education monies--both State and Federal. Title I has always funded a number of bilingual education efforts. State compensatory education funds can also be used for this purpose; in fact, four States either stipulate bilingual education as a priority item for State compensatory education money or include a bilingual/bicultural factor in the funding formula. Connecticut and Washington are in the former category, California (through its Educationally Disadvantaged Youth Program) and Utah in the latter.

Subsequent chapters examine ongoing State compensatory education programs, expired programs, and anticipated programs in as much detail as possible. The final chapter is a directory of persons responsible for each of the programs discussed in this report.

Table 2 summarizes data on State Compensatory Education Programs for fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

Table 3 summarizes how program funds are allocated and whether or not all districts participate within a State.

Table 2. Data for State Compensatory Education Programs

State	Number of Participating LEA's	Number of Children Served	1973-74 Appropriation	1974-75 Appropriation	Total State Title I ESEA Allocation
California					$140,274,995
EDY Program			$81,180,000	$81,300,000	
Miller-Unruh	268 (66 aides)		18,303,750	15,692,625	
Secondary Demonstration			12,985,352	3,045,000	
Teacher Education			750,000	142,000	
Child Development			23,678,500	19,400,000	
Early Childhood			12,500,000	40,000,000	
State Preschool			23,314,000	19,805,000	
Teacher Employment			6,500,000	0	
Project SEED			355,000	0	
Connecticut	163	37,000(Est.)	7,000,000	7,000,000	17,271,134
Colorado[1/]	69	8,363	0	0	14,581,384
Delaware[1/]	7	1,400	0	0	3,721,680
Florida[1/]	67	239,999	0	0	40,974,842
Georgia[2/]	188		0	0	44,699,611
Hawaii					4,751,550
CSAP	7	3,914	[3/]2,274,590	2,274,590	
Act 4	[4/]15	2,651	341,750	341,750	
Maryland					27,043,173
Density Aid[2/]	1	182,000	9,100,000	13,490,000	
Section 106[2/]	23	28,000(Est.)	0	0	

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 2 (continued)

State	Number of Participating LEA's	Number of Children Served	1973-74 Appropriation	1974-75 Appropriation	Total State Title I ESEA Allocation
Massachusetts	40	10,000(Est.)	$2,500,000	$4,000,000	$32,964,735
Michigan					73,845,674
Section 48	19	1,000(Est.)	500,000	750,000	
Section 3	67	112,500	22,500,000	22,500,000	
New York					247,563,367
Urban Ed.[5/]	60	529,853	47,000,000	0	
Chapter 241	754	600,000(Est.)	0	146,000,000(Est.)	
Ohio	384	1,492,744	33,337,400	53,000,000(Est.)	54,911,401
Oregon	1	6,460	1,000,000	1,000,000	13,205,109
Pennsylvania	17	--	1,000,000	1,000,000	80,935,205
Rhode Island	40	14,450(Est.)	2,000,000	2,000,000	5,891,099
Utah	40		600,000	600,000	5,634,606
Virginia[2/]	140	17,210	0	5,163,000	35,677,248
Washington					20,472,510
Urban, Rural, and Racial Disadvantaged Educational Program	39	46,000(Est.)	4,461,021	4,786,779	
Culturally Disadvantaged Program	218	--	3,630,535	3,743,401	

Table 2 (continued)

State	Number of Participating LEA's	Number of Children Served	1973-74 Appropriation	1974-75 Appropriation	Total State Title I ESEA Allocation
Wisconsin	4/ 15	2,700(Est.)	$600,000	$3,100,000	$24,029,151

1/ Expired Programs: LEA and Children statistics are for last year of operation.
2/ Anticipated Programs
3/ Includes $1,089,030 in State funds, $1,052,635 in Federal funds.
4/ Number of projects includes those from LEA's and other agencies.
5/ Expired June 30, 1974.

Table 3. Fund Allocation and District Participation

State	Competitive Grant Program	Formula-Based Program	Participation by All Districts in the State
California			
Educationally Disadvantaged Youth Program	No	Yes	No
Miller-Unruh	Yes	No	No
Secondary Demonstration	Yes	No	No
Teacher Education	Yes	No	No
Child Development	Yes	No	No
Early Childhood	Yes	No	No
State Preschool	Yes	No	No
Teacher Employment	No	Yes	No
Project SEED	Yes	No	No
Connecticut	No	Yes	Yes
Colorado	Yes	No	No
Delaware	Yes	No	No
Florida	No	Yes	Yes
Georgia	--	--	Yes
Hawaii			
Comprehensive School Alienation Program (CSAP)	No	Yes	Yes
Act 4	Yes	No	No
Maryland			
Density Aid	No	Yes	No
Section 106	No	Yes	Yes
Massachusetts	Yes	No	No
Michigan			
Section 48	Yes	No	No
Section 3	Yes	No	No
New York			
Urban Education	No	Yes	No
Chapter 241	No	Yes	Yes

Table 3 (continued)

State	Competitive Grant Program	Formula-Based Program	Participation by All Districts in the State
Ohio	No	Yes	No
Oregon	No	No	No
Pennsylvania	Yes	No	No
Rhode Island	No	Yes	Yes
Utah	No	Yes	Yes
Virginia	No	Yes	Yes
Washington			
Urban, Rural, and Racial Disadvantaged Educational Program	Yes	No	No
Culturally Disadvantaged Program	No	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	Yes	No	No

2. ONGOING PROGRAMS

During the 1973-74 school year, 19 States financed their own compensatory education programs. Twenty programs are discussed in this chapter; the New Jersey bilingual education program is also discussed since the legislature made an appropriation in 1974 but the program will not be fully operative until September 1975. The extent of current State compensatory education programs differs dramatically, from an annual commitment of $600,000 in Utah to more than $154 million for various State-funded efforts in California.

California

Portions of California's State compensatory education program preceded the passage of title I in 1965. After pilot projects for disadvantaged children in San Francisco, funded by the Ford Foundation in 1962 and 1963, proved successful, the State legislature approved Senate Bill 28, the McAteer Act of 1963. Under the act the State Department of Education awarded funds to school districts for pilot projects in compensatory education. In 1964, another McAteer act was passed, providing funds for "enriching experiences" for disadvantaged youth in 27 California school districts.

In 1965 the State legislature created a Division of Compensatory Education within the State Department of Education to administer both the McAteer Act and title I. The division was originally headed by Wilson Riles, now Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education in California. Riles spearheaded the State's continuing commitment to compensatory education.

California's State compensatory education program now includes seven components, the largest of which is the Educationally Disadvantaged Youth (EDY) Program, which began in 1973-74 as an extension of the title I programs in the State. Table 4 indicates the funding levels for all seven programs, plus several programs which have expired including School Housing, Secondary Demonstration Projects in Reading and Mathematics, the Miller-Unruh Bilingual Reading Specialists Program, Miller-Unruh Reading Aides, Teacher Employment, Project SEED, Teacher Education and Professional Development, and Early Childhood Education.

Educationally Disadvantaged Youth Program

In reviewing compensatory education in California in the fall and winter of 1972, the State legislature concluded that "because of differences in family income, differing language barriers, and pupil transiency, differing levels of financial aid are necessary to provide quality education for all students." Thus, the legislature, in Senate Bill 90, passed the Educationally Disadvantaged Youth (EDY) Program. The program is similar

Table 4. Funding for California's State Compensatory Education Program: 1965-1975

Fiscal Year	School Housing[1]	EDY	Secondary Demonstration Projects in Reading and Mathematics	Miller-Unruh Bilingual Reading Specialists Program	Miller-Unruh Reading Aides	Teacher Employment[1]
65-66	$35,888					
66-67			$3,000,000	$1,348,986		
67-68			3,000,000	7,468,885		
68-69			3,000,000	15,344,096		
69-70			3,000,000	21,853,906		
70-71			3,000,000	17,877,437		$6,500,000
71-72			3,000,000	17,855,000		6,500,000
72-73			3,000,000	18,149,625	$57,505	6,500,000
73-74		$81,180,000	2,985,352	18,150,000	153,750	6,500,000
74-75[2]		81,300,000	3,045,000	15,349,625	243,000	0

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 4 (continued)

Fiscal Year	Project SEED[1]	Teacher Education and Professional Development	Child Development	Early Childhood Development	State Preschool[3]	Bilingual Education[1]
65-66					$1,902,259	
66-67					3,302,925	
67-68					3,750,611	
68-69		$325,000			1,060,000	
69-70		499,750			3,000,600	
70-71		742,919	$10,899,712		3,000,600	
71-72		743,529	11,128,000		5,122,000	
72-73	$500,000	717,443	12,789,247		5,328,453	
73-74	355,000	750,000	23,678,500	$12,500,000	23,314,000	$4,000,000
74-75[2]		142,000	19,400,000	40,000	19,805,000	

[1] Expired program.
[2] Estimates
[3] Provides funds to LEA's but is not a compensatory education program, per se.

to title I in terms of both regulations and operations, except that school districts use poverty criteria to designate title I schools while EDY schools are selected solely on the basis of educational needs. A district may use both title I and EDY monies, as well as other State funds, to finance its compensatory education program.

California school districts use a single application to apply for funds under seven programs, including EDY. The other six programs included in the application are:

1. Title I, ESEA
2. Title II (School Library Resources), ESEA
3. Miller-Unruh Basic Reading Act
4. Early Childhood Education
5. Teacher Employment
6. State Preschool

Guidelines and evaluation formats for the seven programs are also consolidated. Thus, the guidelines for EDY, like those for title I, include provisions for needs assessment, comparability, performance objectives (at the classroom, school, and district levels), and parent and community participation, including both school and district advisory committees. Both EDY and title I require local districts to maintain existing local resources for meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged students.

Three factors are used to determine a district's eligibility for EDY funds. These are: (1) an index of the "potential impact of bilingual-bicultural pupils," determined by dividing the percentage of pupils in the district with Spanish and Oriental surnames plus those who are American Indians (as indicated by the annual ethnic survey of the Department of Education) by the statewide average percentage for similar districts (elementary, secondary, or unified); (2) ratio of the district's "index of family poverty," defined as the district's title I entitlement, divided by its average daily attendance in grades 1 through 12; this quotient is then divided by the State average index for family poverty in similar districts; (3) ratio of the district's "index of pupil transiency," as computed by the relationship of the district's average daily attendance to total annual enrollment, divided by the State average index for pupil transiency in similar districts.

Following are the eight data and corresponding figures for an average elementary school district in California receiving EDY funds:

1.	Average daily attendance (ADA)	2,141
2.	Enrollment	3,365
3.	Number of Spanish surnamed students	551
4.	Number of Oriental students	35
5.	Number of American Indian students	5
6.	Total number of pupils	3,696
7.	Amount of latest title I grant	73,624
8.	Number of children in families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) according to title I application	120

The poverty index is thus $\frac{\text{Title I grant}}{\frac{\text{A D A}}{\text{State average}}}$ or $\frac{73624}{\frac{2141}{26.7337}}$ or 1.2363

$\frac{\#\text{'s } 3+4+5 \text{ total pupils}}{\text{State average}}$ or $\frac{591}{\frac{3696}{0.1796}}$ or 0.8903

The transiency index is $\frac{\text{A D A}}{\frac{1 - \text{Enrollment}}{\text{State average}}}$ or $\frac{2141}{\frac{1-3365}{0.1479}}$ or 2.4594

To determine whether the district is eligible to receive EDY funds the average of the above three factors must be 1.0 or higher. The sum of the above ratios is 4.360; divided by three it is 1.5453, greater than the minimum standard for EDY funds.

In allocating EDY resources with the school district, the local educational agency must rank attendance areas according to educational need, with funds allocated first to elementary schools with the greatest needs. Schools participating in EDY programs do not necessarily have title I programs as well, because, after several years of compensatory education programs, the achievement levels of students in some title I schools may be above a district's cutoff mark for EDY funds: This does not mean EDY schools may not receive title I services--it is a matter of local priorities.

The evaluation reporting for almost all compensatory education programs in California, whether State or federally funded, is consolidated in a 37-page format to be completed by each district annually. Since 1973-74 was the first year of the EDY program, no evaluation is as yet available; even when evaluation for the 1973-74 school year is complete, it would be difficult to evaluate any single compensatory education program since most districts used funds from various sources to finance their programs for educationally disadvantaged children.

The evaluation of California's compensatory education efforts in 1972-73, the last year for which complete data were available, indicated that students received more than a month's growth in reading skills for each month of instruction. An average of 11 percent of project participants moved out of the lowest quartile of the distribution on standardized tests between pre- and post-testing. In mathematics, a majority of the compensatory education students achieved gains equal to, or greater than, one month's growth for each month's participation in the program.

Bilingual Education Act

On December 20, 1972, California passed the Bilingual Education Act of 1972. In addition to the seven compensatory education programs financed by the State, the Bilingual Education program provided more than $4 million to 69 local educational agencies in fiscal year 1974.

The law specifies three goals for bilingual education programs: "to develop competence in two languages for all participating pupils, to provide positive reinforcement of the self-image of participating children, and to develop intergroup and intercultural awareness among pupils, parents, and the staff in participating school districts."

Districts may provide bilingual instruction for children of limited English-speaking ability as well as for non-English-speaking children. The Bilingual Education Act defines a non-English speaking child as one "who communicates in his or her home language only. Such child is unable to conduct basic conversations in English or take advantage from classroom instruction in English." Children of limited English-speaking ability are those "who speak a language other than English in their home environment and who are less capable of performing school work in English than in their primary language."

The law defines bilingual education as "the use of two languages, one of which is English, as a means of instruction in any subject or course. It is a means of instruction in which concepts and information are introduced in the dominant language of the student and reinforced in the second language. It recognizes that teaching of language skills is most meaningful and effective when presented in the context of an appreciation of cultural differences and similarities."

California's bilingual education program is designed to encourage local school districts to gradually assume financing of the bilingual projects. Therefore, State guidelines include detailed phase-in requirements which classify bilingual programs in four stages: Program preparation, pilot studies, expansion, and maintenance. The State will reimburse local school districts for 100 percent of the costs of bilingual education during the pilot study and expansion stages. Eighty percent reimbursement is possible during the first year of program maintenance, 40 percent the second year, and 20 percent the third year. By the fourth year of program maintenance, a district will receive no State funds for bilingual education.

Allotments to local school districts are also dependent on the type of bilingual program being offered. A district may receive up to $550, either in combined categorical aid or from the Bilingual Education Act alone, for each student participating in a full bilingualism program. Allocations for transitional, monoliterate, or partial bilingual education programs may amount to $550 per pupil if combined with other categorical aids, but are limited to $350 per pupil if the allocations consist solely of bilingual education funds.

The State encourages local districts to use other resources, especially title I ESEA and the State EDY Program, to help finance bilingual programs. In determining maximum EDY apportionments, a district uses as one factor an index of "potential impact of bilingual-bicultural pupils"; the index is determined by dividing the percentage of pupils

in the district with Spanish and Oriental surnames, and Indian pupils, by the annual ethnic survey conducted by the State Department of Education.

The State guidelines stipulate ways in which the bilingual funds may be used. They are: employment of bilingual teacher aides, purchase of bilingual teaching materials, costs of special inservice training and staff development, reasonable expenses (including transportation, child care, meals, and training) of parent advisory groups on bilingual education, and purchase of special equipment for use exclusively in the bilingual program.

Whether or not a school district develops a bilingual education program, each district in the State is required by law to take an annual count of the number of children of limited English-speaking ability in the district, classifying them by their primary language. Non-English-speaking children are counted separately. The census must be completed by March of each year.

In bilingual education programs, every student in participating grades of a participating school receives services. The law requires that bilingual classes maintain an approximate balance between the number of children whose primary language is English and children who are not proficient in English. No more than two-thirds of the children enrolled in any bilingual class shall be limited English-speaking children.

Other Components

In addition to the EDY program, California's State compensatory education program includes six other components. These are Secondary Demonstration Projects in Reading and Mathematics, the Miller-Unruh Bilingual Reading Specialists Program, Miller-Unruh Reading Aides, Teacher Education and Professional Development, Early Childhood Education, and Child Development. These and several expired programs are discussed briefly in this section; data on the appropriation levels for each program are included in table 2.

Senate Bill 28 approved the spending of $35 million for building or remodeling schools in areas with high concentrations of disadvantaged children. This is the School Housing portion of California's compensatory education program. The legislation was passed in 1963, but money was not appropriated until the 1965-66 school year. An attempt is being made to finish allocations expenditures under this program by June 30, 1975.

In 1973-74 there were 24 demonstration junior high schools in California, receiving State compensatory education funds to develop demonstration programs in math and reading. The programs must be cost effective in meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged secondary students.

A single allocation covers the Miller-Unruh Reading Specialists Program and Bilingual Reading Aides. The Reading Specialists program was designed to serve children in grades K-3 who have reading problems, as evidenced by the results of a standardized reading test. The program began in September 1966; during the 1973-74 school year, 1,659 reading specialists served 268 school districts throughout California. The bilingual reading aides assisted the specialists in districts where 15 percent of the children came from homes where English was not spoken and where 30 percent of the children were achieving in the lowest quartile according to standardized test results. In 1973-74, 66 school districts employed 228 Miller-Unruh aides.

The teacher employment program, begun in 1970, was designed to reduce the teacher:pupil ratio in selected elementary schools to 1:25. The compensatory education staff in the State Department of Education designates areas of the most concentrated poverty and/or social tension in the State for participation in the program. If teachers are not available, 25 percent of a school district's teacher employment allocation may be used to reduce the adult:pupil ratio to 1:20. During the 1973-74 school year, 37 school districts received teacher employment funds. The program was line-vetoed out of the budget for the 1974-75 school year.

Four California school districts participated in Project SEED, a program designed to demonstrate the ability of educationally disadvantaged elementary school children to perform in the area of abstract mathematics. The project operated in fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

The Teacher Education and Professional Development program funds inservice training programs, designed to promote competency-based education, throughout California. The program has two components: (1) recruiting people from low socioeconomic backgrounds and from minority groups to serve as teachers for disadvantaged children; and (2) retraining school personnel to make their teaching of disadvantaged children more effective.

The child development program promotes innovations in the care of preschool children. Demonstration projects, including satellite homes and centers for improving parent effectiveness, encourage new approaches in infant care and the care of handicapped and sick children, and also encourage expansion of the educational component of traditional day care arrangements.

Beginning in 1973, the State legislature targeted a portion of the State's early childhood education funds for educationally disadvantaged children.

Connecticut

The authorizing legislation for Connecticut's State-financed compensatory education program preceded the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by several months. In February 1965 the State legislature passed Section 10-266, the State Act for Disadvantaged Children (SADC), to assist local school districts "in furnishing special educational programs

or services designed to improve or accelerate the education of children whose educational achievement has been or is being restricted by economic, social, or environmental disadvantages . . . ."

The statute spelled out the types of programs SADC funds were to be used for; these included preschool programs, remedial education, work-study projects, reductions in class sizes, special tutoring, and programs for dropouts. An analysis of programs financed under SADC during the 1973-74 school year indicated that most school districts concentrated both State and Federal compensatory education funds at the preschool and early elementary grade levels, with instruction primarily in basic skills and reading.

An example of the type of program funded under SADC is the Intensive Developmental Reading and Language Arts Program in New London. Using $98,171 in SADC funds, the program individualized reading instruction for 136 kindergarten through 4th grade students. Four full-time and one part-time teachers, a speech therapist, a social worker aide, and a teacher's aide worked with participating children in small groups for about one hour daily. The program was designed to improve the children's image of themselves as learners and to increase their reading skills. Teachers used living things, including plants, flowers, and small animals, in the classroom as a focus for observations, discussions, writing, and reading. Children took field trips regularly, developing their own learning materials as a result of these experiences. A variety of learning equipment was available to help teachers individualize instruction.

The State Act for Disadvantaged Children originally authorized funds for school districts to help only educationally deprived children in public schools. An amendment to the act in 1967 expanded the program to cover educationally deprived children attending nonpublic schools and specifically tied SADC to title I. The amendment said: "To the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in such town or school district who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such town or school district shall make provisions for including educational services and arrangements in which such children can participate . . . including such services as may be provided under P.L. 89-10 (title I, ESEA) of the eighty-ninth congress."

Another 1967 amendment implemented intercommunity compacts, programs for inner city children carried on in suburban communities; the State legislature made $500,000 available annually to cover the costs of the program. The sending district, the district legally responsible for the education of the students, received a grant to finance program costs and, in turn, paid tuition for participating students to attend schools in the receiving district. State funds went to the receiving district to cover half the cost of transporting the students or $80 per pupil, whichever was less.

Connecticut committed approximately $54 million in State funds from 1966 to 1973 for compensatory education. In 1966, the first year of the program, SADC funds totaled less than $4 million; they rose to a high of $8.5 million in fiscal years 1969 and 1970, but dropped to $7 million in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 because of a massive reduction in State spending. SADC funds for the 1973-74 school year included $6.1 million for programs for educationally deprived children in public schools, $0.4 million for children in private schools, and $0.5 million for inter-community compacts. Table 5 shows a breakdown of SADC and title I ESEA funds in Connecticut from 1966 to 1974.

Table 5. Funding and Number of Pupils Served in SADC and Title I ESEA Programs in Connecticut: 1966-74

Fiscal Year		SADC		Title I ESEA	
		Pupils	Dollars*	Pupils	Dollars
65-66	Public	51,741	3,447,381	44,709	
	Nonpublic			2,788	5,184,050
66-67	Public	42,576	6,094,955	46,743	
	Nonpublic			4,406	7,449,810
67-68	Public	45,021	5,867,359	61,612	
	Nonpublic	4,167	229,910	2,404	7,791,902
68-69	Public	40,132	6,106,978	41,433	
	Nonpublic	4,546	532,794	3,496	7,256,003
69-70	Public	38,067	7,698,639	39,075	
	Nonpublic	3,832	498,167	4,444	10,278,799
70-71	Public	30,335	7,388,752	38,319	
	Nonpublic	2,430	485,922	2,888	10,788,070
71-72	Public	26,189	5,598,152	39,531	
	Nonpublic	2,238	366,094	2,091	12,290,094
72-73	Public	33,514	6,191,450	37,603	
	Nonpublic	2,077	406,250	2,007	11,538,264
73-74	Public	31,708	6,093,838	38,477	
	Nonpublic	1,774	406,162	2,177	12,089,019

*Does not include $500,000 annually, beinning in 1967-68, for inter-community compacts.

Like the title I formula, SADC grants are determined through the use of census and AFDC data. However, the poverty indicator for SADC funds is a $4,000 income, whereas title I funding is based on the number of children in families with an annual income of $2,000 or less. All Connecticut communities receive a portion of the annual SADC appropriation, based on the number of families in the school district with incomes below $4,000, according to the 1970 Census, and the total number of children aged 0 to 18 in families receiving AFDC payments. Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven, the largest urban areas in Connecticut, receive the largest SADC grants.

The purposes of SADC are similar to those of title I--meeting the serious educational needs of disadvantaged children. In 1973-74, 70 percent of SADC funds were used in programs jointly funded with title I money. Application, evaluation, and financial reporting formats for the two programs are identical, and the State Department of Education issued joint guidelines to cover title I and SADC programs, with one major exception: Parental involvement is not mandatory under the State-financed compensatory education program.

The guidelines emphasize four factors to be considered in planning programs for educationally deprived children:

1. School year programs are more effective than summer programs.

2. A minimum of $300 per pupil (above normal local expenditures for each student) should be spent.

3. First priority should be given to preschool programs or programs aimed at educationally deprived children in the earliest years of schooling.

4. Support of participating children should generally continue for several years.

Both the State Act for Disadvantaged Children and title I require that local compensatory education programs be evaluated annually; since 70 percent of these programs involve both Federal and State funds, the evaluations are often inseparable. In 1972-73, the latest year for which data were available, 54,199 students received services provided with $18,135,964 in State and Federal compensatory education funds, excluding $500,000 for intercommunity compacts. Data from 30 programs offering language arts instruction to 1,326 preschool and kindergarten children revealed that 74 percent of the participants showed average rates of growth exceeding their average chronological age development. Pre- and post-test information from 70 math programs serving 2,796 students in grades 1 through 11 indicated that in 64 percent of the programs pupils on the average achieved at a rate exceeding a year's growth for each year of instruction. In 65 percent of the 239 reading programs evaluated, students exceeded a year's growth in a year's time.

Florida

Of all the State-financed compensatory education programs, Florida's has perhaps the most direct relationship to title I; the programs began in 1973 as a direct result of uncertainty over title I funding, and the State appropriation appears to be linked to Florida's title I allotment.

During fiscal year 1973 Florida, like most other States, did not receive its full title I entitlement, in this case $26,968,254. Of this sum more than $2 million was impounded by the Federal Government; this was money that school districts in Florida had already obligated to cover the costs of their title I programs. Compensatory education had made a significant impact on Florida schools and, to alleviate worry over continued Federal funding and to help stabilize local school districts' commitment to compensatory education, the State legislature passed a law obligating State funds to compensatory education. The statute read:

> A supplement to the base student cost shall be added to all full-time equivalent students in basic programs qualifying for compensatory education in accordance with criteria, including low achievement test scores, socioeconomic level, and low standard English comprehension level, established by regulations of the state board. Such regulations shall be designed to maintain consistency with applicable federal law and regulations . . . For the 1973-74 fiscal year a supplement of five hundredths (.05) multiplied by the base student cost for one full-time equivalent student shall be earned for each qualifying student in grades kindergarten through twelve.

Thus, the State law, in the phrase "to maintain consistency with applicable federal law and regulations," tied the State compensatory education program directly to Federal efforts. Regulations developed by the State Department of Education to govern the State program made the relationship to title I even more direct; State allocations were to be based on a count of students eligible for title I services and each school district was ordered to use State and Federal compensatory education funds to finance a single program. Therefore, planning, application, operation, and evaluation of the State compensatory education and title I programs were to be done jointly.

Under the formula outlined in the State law, the State would provide $29.07 in compensatory education funds for each qualifying student. In fiscal year 1973, Florida had 239,999 children in families with incomes below $4,000 (the poverty indicator for title I ESEA programs although, in practice, enough money is available only to cover services to children in families with incomes below $2,000); at $29.07 per child, full funding of the State compensatory education program would have required an appropriation of $6,976,767. However, the appropriation bill passed by the State legislature provided only $5,916,192 for compensatory education. Therefore, the State Department of Education proportionally reduced the funds for each school district.

Florida's compensatory education program was funded for only one year. Although the statute remains on the books, no appropriation was made to finance the program in 1974. State legislators believed Florida school districts would receive increased title I funding as a result of a new title I appropriation formula contained in House Resolution 69; their State representatives and senators in Washington assured them the formula was likely to be adopted. Therefore, the State legislature ordered the State Department of Education to study the status of compensatory education in Florida during the 1974-75 school year in order to determine what needs, if any, were not being met. The law authorizing the State compensatory education program could then be amended and funds appropriated to cover such needs.

Hawaii

Hawaii's compensatory education program, as coordinated by the Compensatory Education Section of the Department of Education's Office of Instructional Services, incorporates both State and federally financed programs, including but not limited to title I ESEA, Follow Through, Model Cities, the Comprehensive School Alienation Program, and Act 4. The last two are State funded programs; they deal with very well-defined target populations--dropouts or potential dropouts and native Hawaiians, respectively.

Comprehensive School Alienation Program

The Comprehensive School Alienation Program (CSAP) had several forerunners and is actually a conglomerate of three programs aimed at dropouts and potential dropouts.

The first move toward compensatory education in Hawaii occurred in 1961, with the passage of Act 125, the Special Motivation Program, which provided school districts with funds aimed at preventing dropouts by increasing guidance, tutorial, and academic services to alienated youths. The program was expanded in February 1969, using title I funds. However, the State reassumed full financial responsiblity for the dropout program the following September and reorganized it as part of the Statewide Dropout Program in September 1970. The Statewide Dropout Program, in addition to the Special Motivation Program, included two federally funded projects, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Vocational-Technical Work Study program; the combined programs were retitled the Comprehensive School Alienation Program in 1971.

Youths aged 9 through 19 identified as dropouts or potential dropouts are the target population of CSAP. The State defines dropout as "a pupil who leaves school for any reason except death before graduation or completion of a program and without transferring to another school . . . Such an individual is considered a dropout whether his dropping out occurs before or after he has passed compulsory school attendance age and, where

applicable, whether or not he has completed a minimum required amount of school work." The State's working definition of a potential dropout includes such factors as poor attendance, recurring referrals for behavior problems, failure in one or more grades, poor academic performance, and, in some cases, serious financial difficulties. The Department of Education has developed a quick screening instrument, known as form 419-C, to identify potential dropouts; when completed, it includes data on family background, school attendance, academic performance, and extracurricular activities. Weights varying from -3 to +3 are applied to answers; a score of +10 or higher identifies a student as a potential dropout.

The CSAP includes six components:

1. Identification and reporting system to identify potential dropouts and maintain records of program participation, behavior patterns, etc.

2. Counseling and guidance by intraschool teams composed of school administrators, counselors, aides, parents, and other school and community personnel.

3. Tutorial-remedial services to provide instruction to participants through modified curricula and a variety of activities. Particularly important are off-campus classes.

4. Supportive services organized by part-time advisors who plan and supervise cultural and motivational activities during off-school hours.

5. Work experiences which give students an opportunity to test their vocational choices and earn money. This portion of CSAP is financed with Federal funds.

6. Inservice training to increase the effectiveness of program personnel in working with alienated youths.

A good example of a CSAP project is the Continuing Education Class in the Windward Oahu District. Begun in September 1970, the class offers 5 hours of instruction each week to an average of 25 girls forced to drop out of school temporarily because of pregnancy. The class includes instruction in language arts, social studies, personal development, math, arts and cratfs, family foods, plant science, family clothing, and foreign language. Students remain registered in their regular school, and continuing education teachers keep counselors at the schools up to date on each student's progress. All credits are transferable.

CSAP resources are allocated to seven Hawaii school districts based on the dropout count and the proportion of students in the grades to be served. For the 1973-74 school year the seven districts received a total of $2,141,665 to finance 87 CSAP projects. The more than $2 million

allocation included $1,089,030 in State funds authorized for the Statewide Dropout Program, $991,230 in Neighborhood Youth Corps funds, and $61,405 for the Vocational-Technical Work Study program. Table 6 shows the funding levels of CSAP from 1965, when it was still limited to the Special Motivation Program.

Table 6. Funding of Comprehensive School Alienation Program (CSAP) and Act 4 in Hawaii: 1965-75

Fiscal year	CSAP*	Act 4
65-66	687,970	235,513
66-67	415,040	250,708
67-68	374,718	226,741
68-69	614,910	271,951
69-70	918,156	422,034
70-71	1,569,250	375,067
71-72	1,711,687	341,750
72-73	1,709,044	371,750
73-74	2,274,590	341,750
74-75**	2,274,590	341,750

*Includes Neighborhood Youth Corps funds, and, beginning in 1968, Vocational-Technical Work Study Program funds.

**Projected figures

The guidelines for CSAP and title I are substantially different because CSAP serves a much more limited target population; however, both programs mandate parental participation and require specific evaluations. Staffing and funding difficulties hindered a comprehensive evaluation of CSAP in Hawaii, but data collected manually indicated the program was successful. More significantly, of the 487 actual dropouts served by the program during the 1971-72 school year, the last year for which evaluative data were available, 49.9 percent returned to school in September 1972. The percentage in the numbers of suspensions and dropouts throughout the State also decreased.

Act 4

The second part of Hawaii's State-financed compensatory education program is known as Act 4. Established in 1965, Act 4 is an amendment to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920; it provides that funds be allotted to finance educational improvement projects for the children of Hawaiian home lands lessees.

Studies conducted by Hawaii's Legislative Reference Bureau and other agencies indicated that Hawaiian home lands children had difficulty adjusting to socially competitive situations, entered kindergarten with educational deficiencies, had difficulty reading, and had low educational attainments. Act 4 projects, concentrating on preschool and early elementary grade children, are designed to alleviate these educational disadvantages. Any public or private agency working with the target children may apply for an Act 4 grant. An Act 4 Advisory Committee, including representatives from the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, the University of Hawaii, the State Department of Education, Kamehha Schools, the Liliuokalani Trust, Hawaii Homestead areas, and the general community review project proposals and recommend grants to the Superintendent of Education.

During the 1973-74 school year, 15 Act 4 projects served 2,651 children with $341,750 in State funds; fund requests for the year actually totaled $501,082, but appropriation limitations prevented any new projects from being funded and required some modifications in existing projects. Table 6 indicates the funding levels for Act 4 from 1965 to 1975. Five of the 15 funded projects were preschool programs. Others aimed at basic skills improvement, especially in reading and oral language, or increased motivation for learning.

Like title I, Act 4 guidelines include provisions for parental involvement, needs assessment, performance objectives, and evaluations. An interim evaluation of Act 4 projects completed in January 1974 indicated that, in general, there was noticeable improvement in participants' oral/reading skills; their attitudes toward themselves and school improved; and teachers introduced a variety of new teaching activities. Pre- and post-tests documented gains of each project.

Act 299

In anticipation of Hawaii's inclusion in the Federal Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, the State legislature in 1967 passed Act 299, the Progressive Neighborhoods Act. The act was designed to coordinate rehabilitation efforts and to demonstrate feasible programs for rebuilding blighted areas of the State. Although the act is not limited to education and is not, strictly speaking, a compensatory education program, it does include provisions for a model schools program.

The model schools program was initiated to develop exemplary school demonstration programs aimed at making more effective use of educational resources in multiproblem neighborhoods. Originally a model school was established in Nanakuli; it included a multipurpose library for school and community use. When the provisions of the Progressive Neighborhoods Act were amended to include Kalihi-Palama, Palolo, Waimanalo, and other areas of the State, more educational projects were developed. These included special guidance, counseling, and tutorial services at Farrington High School and similar activities at Waianae and Nankuli high schools.

Illinois

Illinois provides financial support for bilingual education with State revenues. State funds committed to bilingual education increased dramatically from $200,000 in 1971 to nearly $8 million in fiscal year 1975. State funds now provide bilingual instruction for approximately 23,000 children--nearly two-thirds of them in the Chicago area. Although 90 percent of the State money is used in projects for Spanish-speaking students, bilingual programs have also been implemented in nine other languages--Chinese, French, Greek, Italian, Japanese, Cerbo-Croation, Filipino, Korean, and Arabic.

The big thrust for bilingual education in Illinois came with the passage of House Bill 1223, which was signed into law on September 10, 1973. The law included five separate legislative intentions:

1. To provide greater statutory authority for the provision of bilingual education programs.

2. To establish the concept that all basic subject matter courses should be taught in a language the student understands until he is capable of functioning in English (probably after 3 years).

3. To mandate by 1976 bilingual education in any attendance center with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability from the same language background.

4. To liberalize certification requirements for bilingual education teachers.*

5. To change the method of school reimbursement.*

Section 14C-1 of the law summarizes its purpose:

> The General Assembly finds that there are large numbers of children in this State who come from environments where the primary language is other than English. Experience has

*These provisions are being studied for possible amendment.

shown that public school classes in which instruction is given only in English are often inadequate for the education of children whose native tongue is another language. The General Assembly, therefore, believes that a program of transitional bilingual education can meet the needs of these children and facilitate their integration into the regular public school curriculum.

The law defines children of limited English-speaking ability as "(1) children who were not born in the United States whose native tongue is a language other than English and who are incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English; and (2) children who were born in the United States of parents possessing no or limited English-speaking ability and who are incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English."

According to the law, a program in transitional bilingual education is "a full-time program of instruction:

1. in all those courses of subjects which a child is required by law to receive and which are required by the child's school district which shall be given in the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability who are enrolled in the program and also in English;

2. in the reading and writing of the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability who are enrolled in the program and in the oral comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing of English; and

3. in the history and culture of the country, territory, or geographic area which is the native land of the parents of children of limited English-speaking ability who are enrolled in the program and in the history and culture of the United States;

or a part-time program of instruction based on the educational needs of those children of limited English-speaking ability who do not need a full-time program of instruction."

After July 1, 1976, every attendance center in Illinois with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability in the same language classification must have a transitional bilingual education program. Such programs are optional during the 1974-75 and 1975-76 school years, allowing school districts to close the gap between voluntary programs involving a minority of the needy students and required programs involving most.

The law requires each district in Illinois to take count by March 1st each year of the number of children of limited English-speaking ability in the district, classifying them according to their primary language, grade

level, age, or achievement level. Parents must be notified in writing of a child's enrollment in a bilingual education program. Parents may withdraw a child from the program at the close of any semester or at the time of the original notification of enrollment.

In developing the bilingual education program, school administrators must be careful not to segregate children of limited English-speaking ability. State guidelines require a district to show how integration with the regular curriculum and student body will occur. The law specifies that "in those courses or subjects in which verbalization is not essential to an understanding of the subject matter, including but not necessarily limited to art, music, and physical education, children of limited English-speaking ability shall participate fully with their English-speaking contemporaries."

State guidelines specify a student:teacher ratio of not more than 23:1 in bilingual programs. The State will reimburse school districts for full-day self-contained programs where the bilingual classroom contains a proportionate representation of children of English-speaking background; where 75 percent or more of the school's student body is of non-English-speaking background; and where the only students enrolled in the program are those who speak virtually no English and, consequently, would not profit from academic instruction in the regular school program.

The law also includes specific provisions for teacher certification. It says preference should be given for employment to teachers "who have the relevant foreign cultural background established through residency abroad or by being raised in a non-English-speaking environment." According to the law, teachers of transitional bilingual education must (1) possess an adequate speaking and reading ability in a language other than English and communicative skills in English; (2) have a valid teaching certificate; or (3) be within 1 year of having had a certificate from a foreign country.

The evaluation requirements for Illinois' bilingual program include a narrative self-assessment prepared by the local school district, an assessment to be conducted by a team of specialists from outside the district, a self-evaluation where the only outsider is the team leader and all other team members are from the district and a statewide testing program. The State has 700 control students for comparison purposes in evaluating the bilingual program.

Louisiana

Louisiana's State-financed bilingual education program began in 1968 with the passage of a State law to require French instruction in the elementary grades. However, the program was not implemented immediately because of a lack of funds and an insufficient number of certified French teachers.

The bilingual program actually got underway in 1972 with the cooperation of the State Legislature, the State Department of Education, the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL), and the government of France. The legislature authorized $250,000 for the first year of the program, with the State Department of Education providing another $250,000. CODOFIL undertook the search for qualified French teachers and agreed to extend its cultural affairs program by allowing experienced teachers to teach in Louisiana in lieu of military service.

The statewide pilot program in 1972-73 involved 100 teachers and seven consultants from France, serving 16,500 children in grades 1 to 3 from 95 schools in 20 Louisiana parishes (counties). Participation was voluntary. The State appropriated $1,300,000 for the program in 1974-75; the money provided salaries for 225 schools in 36 of Louisiana's 66 parishes. The recruitment effort has been expanded to include Belgium and Quebec; approximately 170 of the teachers are from France, 4 from Belgium, and 51 from Quebec.

The foreign teachers are supplementary staff members; they assist the regular classroom teachers but in no way replace them. Each associate teacher teaches eight class sections of 30 to 40 minutes for a maximum of 5 1/2 hours per day. Instruction is concentrated on French language arts with reinforcement activities in reading and math.

Louisiana's bilingual education program has five objectives:

1. Develop in participating children progressive skills in the French language, including listening-comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing.

2. Demonstrate that a continuing program of second language learning is feasible, educationally sound, and can fit within the existing educational program of the local school system.

3. Show that a program of second language skills will assist the child in developing communication in his first or native language, regardless of socioeconomic status, racial origin, cultural background, or regional differences.

4. Train existing elementary classroom teachers within the 36 parishes so they can eventually assume the French instructional program themselves.

5. Provide night classes in French for parents and interested community members.

The teacher training component of the program takes place at six universities in Louisiana. Planned cooperatively by the State Department of Education, the French Cultural Services, and the universities, the program trains 231 teachers with seminar classes during the spring and fall semesters and a 4-week intensive summer course.

The State program requires an outside evaluation and use of an independent educational auditor. These are the findings of the 1972-73 evaluation, the last year for which the evaluation is complete:

1. There was no significant difference between experimental and control group students' achievement in reading and math, despite the fear of some parents and educators that use of regular classroom time for French instruction would lower achievement levels.

2. Standardized test results indicated children in different areas of the State achieved comparably.

3. Children participating in the program made significant gains in their listening-comprehension and global understanding of French.

4. Mastery of the linguistic contents of the program by participating children surpassed minimal expectations.

5. Local superintendents were generally satisfied with the program.

6. More than 96 percent of the parents strongly supported the program.

Maryland

Begnning in 1972, the Maryland legislature authorized the Density Aid Program: additional per pupil grants of $50 per pupil for localities with very high population densities (more than 8,000 persons per square mile). Baltimore City was the only school system in the State which qualified; it received $10.8 million in fiscal year 1973 and $9.1 million in 1974 to "provide compensatory programs for students with special educational needs resulting from educationally or economically disadvantaged environments." The additional per pupil grant was increased to $75 in 1974, and Baltimore City schools received $13,490,000 in Density Aid for the 1974-75 school year.

In the first year of the program, Baltimore schools used the Density Aid funds to reduce class size, improve pupil personnel services, and introduce early childhood education programs. For the 1973-74 and 1974-75 school years, funds had to be used for one of three priorities--improvement of reading, math improvement, and improvement of human relations. Title I ESEA programs in Maryland must concentrate on only the first two priorities.

Baltimore City has 210 public schools; 118 of them are eligible to receive title I services, although only 71 elementary schools actually do. All title I eligible schools participate in the Density Aid program. Thus, 71 of the 118 schools participating in the program are also title I schools.

Guidelines for the title I and Density Aid programs differ in several respects. Title I projects may serve only preschool through 4th grade students and must concentrate on reading or math; Density Aid projects may serve both elementary and secondary school students and may deal with human relations, as well as reading or math.

No evaluation is required for the Density Aid program.

Massachusetts

Like Hawaii's Special Motivation Program, which was directed at dropouts and potential dropouts, Masschusetts' State-financed compensatory education program has a limited target population. Passed on November 4, 1971, the Transitional Bilingual Education law is designed to provide compensatory education to children of limited English-speaking ability.

The law defines children of limited English-speaking ability in two ways:

1. Children who were not born in the United State whose native tongue is a language other than English and who are incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English.

2. Children who were born in the United States of non-English-speaking parents and who are incapable of performing ordinary classwork in English.

To identify eligible children each school district must conduct a census, to be completed no later than March 1 of each year, to determine the number of children in the district with limited English-speaking ability; both children attending school and children who are not in school are counted. Persons taking the census must be able to communicate in the home language of the children being counted.

Any Massachusetts school district with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability in any single language classification, including Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, French, Italian, or Greek, who are not attending a private school must establish a transitional bilingual education program. Children of limited English-speaking ability from different primary language backgrounds may be involved in the same transitional bilingual education program only with the approval of the Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education in the State Department of Education.

The law requires the school district to notify the parents or legal guardians of each participant of his involvement in the program; the notification must be by mail and must contain a "simple, non-technical description of the purposes, methods, and content of the program."

Regulations governing the operation of transitional bilingual education programs are very exact. The program of instruction must include three components:

1. Instruction in all courses which a child is required by law to take, with such instruction given in both English and the native language of participating children.

2. Instruction in the reading and writing of the children's native language and in the aural comprehension, reading, writing, and speaking of English.

3. Instruction in the history and culture of the country or geographic area which is the native land of the parents of participating children.

For courses in which verbalization is not essential to an understanding of the subject matter, such as physical education, art, or music, children of limited English-speaking ability should participate jointly with their English-speaking peers.

Other regulations require that the student:teacher ratio in transitional bilingual education classes be 15:1 or, when a bilingual aide is present, 20:1; that the age span in the classes, from the oldest to the youngest child, be no more than 3 years; and that continual liaison with parents of participating students be maintained.

The laws on Transitional Bilingual Education also specify a new certification category for teachers of transitional bilingual education. A teacher must meet three criteria:

1. He must be able to speak and read in a language other than English at S-4 and R-4 levels of Foreign Service Institutes' native or bilingual proficiency rating.

2. He must score at S-3 and R-3 levels of the institutes' rating for communicative skills in English. This requires an ability to carry on formal and informal conversations on most topics and the ability to read standard newspaper items, routine correspondence, and technical information in his special field.

3. He must understand the history and culture of the country whose language he speaks. This requires meeting the Statement of Qualification for Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages: "An understanding of the cultural and linguistically different people and their culture such as is achieved through travel and residence abroad, through study of systematic descriptions of the other cultures, geography, history, art, social customs, and contemporary civilization." (Of the country where the native language is spoken.)

The State reimburses local school districts for the costs of the transitional bilingual education program in the amount by which expenditures exceed the average per pupil expenditure in the district. The State considers an extra cost of $250 to $500 as reasonable to cover the costs of the program. Transportation and teacher training costs are also partially reimbursable.

The funding level for the transitional bilingual education program was fixed at $1.5 million in fiscal year 1972 and $2.5 million in both 1973 and 1974. An appropriation of $4.0 million is fixed for 1975 and subsequent years. Priority in funding is given to programs for younger children.

Title I funds are sometimes used to supplement the State expenditures; in its regulations the State specifically recommends the use of title I funds whenever possible to cover the costs of teacher aides in transitional bilingual education programs. When title I and State compensatory education funds are used jointly, the local school district must correlate the two programs. Children participating in the transitional bilingual education program may also be receiving other services financed under title I.

Like title I, the Transitional Bilingual Education Program requires parental involvement. Each school district with a program must have an advisory council with a minimum membership of five parents; no council can represent more than 300 students. The council must meet at least once a year.

Each school district with a Transitional Bilingual Education Program must establish a committee with a minimum of three members to evaluate the program annually. The committee must include a representative from the school administration, the program itself, and the parent advisory committee.

Michigan

Michigan has funded a State compensatory education program since 1964-65; however, projects funded during the first 5 years of the program were largely unseccessful. Drastic changes in program eligibility requirements and program emphasis occurred each year from 1965 through 1970, preventing any continuity of effort and causing much confusion at the local level; longitudinal studies and meaningful evaluations were impossible.

The bulk of the current State compensatory education program, known as Section 3, was first implemented in 1971; 67 school districts receive a total of $22.5 million annually to serve more than 112,000 children who are educationally deprived. A smaller component of the Michigan compensatory education program is Section 48, Nonresidential Alternative Juvenile Rehabilitation Program, begun during the 1973-74 school year

to provide remedial academic and social rehabilitation services to delinquents or prospective delinquents.

Section 48

The Nonresidential Alternative Juvenile Rehabilitation Program was part of Michigan's State School Aid Act of 1973-74; it was approved by the State Board of Education on October 3, 1973. In the first year of the program, 3 intermediate school districts and 16 local districts received grants totaling $500,000 to provide rehabilitation services to more than 1,000 youths. An estimated $750,000 will be available for similar programs in 1974-75.

Program participants must be referred by the courts or recommended by a screening committee composed of representative of the juvenile courts and the schools. Programs may be designed as full-time alternatives to the regular school curriculum, part-time alternatives, or as supportive services of the regular school program.

Section 3

Section 3 differed from previous State-financed compensatory education efforts in Michigan in many ways. The State's financial commitment, which had increased gradually since 1965, reached $22.5 million, up from $16.3 million the year before Section 3 was implemented. A school district's eligibility for the program was no longer based on socio-economic criteria, such as race, family income, or geographic location, but on academic deficiencies of students in the applicant district. And, under the original legislation, districts receiving funds under Section 3 were guaranteed 3 years of program participation; a provision of the State School Aid Act of 1973-74 extended the length of guaranteed participation through the 1974-75 school year.

The Section 3 program is actually a performance contract between the State and the 67 participating school districts. It was designed to implement the six steps of the Michigan Accountability Model:

1. Identification of common goals for compensatory education.
2. Adoption of student performance expectations.
3. Identification of student's needs against expectations.
4. Analysis of delivery of compensatory education services.
5. Evaluation and testing of such services once delivered.
6. Recommendation for improvement of compensatory education programs.

Under this performance-based compensatory education program, each participating school district establishes performance objectives in reading and mathematics, with the minimum performance objective (according to rules developed by the State Department of Education) an increase in achievement equivalent to 1 year's growth for each year of program participation. In order for a school district to receive the full $200 per pupil grant allotted under the program, each student must achieve at least 75 percent of the specified objectives. A district receives a prorated amount of the $200 per pupil allocation for each student who masters at least some of the objectives.

A district is considered eligible for a Section 3 grant if at least 15 percent of its total enrollment in grades K-6 and not less than 30 students in grades K-6 are found to be in need of substantial improvement in their basic cognitive skills. The number of pupils having such needs was determined for the first year of the program, 1971-72, by using the following four steps:

1. A statewide percentile ranking of the scores of students in grades 4 and 7 on the State assessment battery administered in January 1971 was computed.

2. The percentage of 4th grade students in each district who scored at the 15 percentile or below was multiplied by the aggregate enrollment of the district in grades K-4 on the fourth Friday following Labor Day of the previous school year.

3. The percentage of 7th grade students who scored at or below the 15 percentile was multiplied by the aggregate enrollment of the district in grades 5 and 6 on the fourth Friday following Labor Day of the previous school year.

4. Add the products of #2 and #3. This was the number of students considered to be in need of improvement in their basic cognitive skills.

Using this formula, 138 of Michigan's 530 school districts were eligible to receive Section 3 grants. Since available funds were distributed in decreasing order of the concentrations of students in need of help, only 67 districts actually received grants. The same districts continued receiving grants at least through fiscal year 1975.

Section 3 specified some of the ways in which a school district may use State compensatory education funds. These included, but were not limited to, employment of additional personnel, purchase of instructional devices and teaching materials, leasing of portable classrooms, inservice training of teachers and other staff members, and nutrition and health care for eligible students. An analysis of Section 3 expenditures for the 1972-73 school year, the last year for which complete evaluative data

were available, showed that of the total reported expenditures ($21,204,701 in the regular school year and $920,305 in summer), 73.6 percent were for instructional salaries and inservice training, 16.6 percent for educational materials, 4.6 percent for facilities, and 5.2 percent for administrative services. Unlike previous State compensatory education programs in Michigan, there are few State regulations controlling the content of local Section 3 projects; local school district personnel, in conjunction with parents and community members, plan the projects in accordance with local needs.

The evaluation of the 1972-73 Section 3 programs indicated that more than 52 percent of the 112,500 children receiving services achieved 75 percent or more of the prespecified objectives set by local school districts. Thus, the 67 districts received the full $200 per student allotment for the 1973-74 school year for these 58,762 students; this amounted to $17,700,000 or 78.7 percent of the $22.5 million appropriation for 1973-74. Districts received partial payments for students who achieved at less than the 75 percent level of accomplishment. No allocation was given for 9,118 students who achieved at the zero level of accomplishment or for 3,217 students for whom data were either unreported or incomplete. Thus, $4,318,788 of the $22.5 million appropriation for fiscal year 1974 were unearned. Under an amendment to Section 3, the State Deparment of Education used this money for reallocation to participating school districts, based on the condition that the district provide a different educational delivery system that would assure students of attaining the necessary achievement level. Thus, districts get a second chance to earn the $4,318,788 that was unearned in 1972-73.

Like title I, Section 3 requires parental involvement and comparability; to insure that a school district continues to support children receiving services under Section 3 at the same level that it supports other children, a provision of Section 3 requires participating school districts to use title I comparability reporting requirements for Section 3 as well. About 30 percent of the children being served by Section 3 programs in Michigan also receive help under title I.

Bilingual Education Program

Michigan's bilingual education law was passed during the 1974 session of the Michigan legislature. The law requires that, beginning with the 1974-75 school year, school districts with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability must have a bilingual education program. The program will be optional in other districts. The law defines bilingual instruction as "the use of two languages, one of which is English, as media of instruction for speaking, reading, writing, or comprehension." Guidelines for implementation of the program are being developed.

New Jersey

The New Jersey bilingual education program will become fully operative in September 1975. Approximately 22,000 children in 40 school districts are expected to be served.

The law requires New Jersey school districts with 20 or more children with limited English-speaking ability to establish a bilingual education program within a 1-year grace period.

In 1974 the State legislature appropriated $250,000 to expand New Jersey's one-man Bureau of Bilingual Education, establish a bilingual educational resources center, and begin three pilot programs. The pilot programs, located in urban, rural, and suburban areas, got underway in January 1975.

New Mexico

New Mexico has had three State laws pertaining to bilingual education. In 1969 Senate Bill 270 indicated the importance of bilingual education by including a provision that "if within its financial ability, any school district may establish in any level of instruction a bilingual and bicultural program of study involving a culture in which a language other than English is predominantly spoken in the home environment of any number of students within the school district." The bill did not provide any State funds for bilingual education or mandate the development of such a program at the local level.

Senate Bill 155, passed in 1971 and entitled the Bilingual Instruction Act, included a $100,000 appropriation for State bilingual programs. The purpose of the act was:

> To provide for the meeting of the special educational needs of children in grades one, two, and three who have limited English-speaking ability because they come from environments where the dominant language is other than English. The purpose of this act is to help these children in these grades to develop greater competence in English, to become more proficient in the use of two languages, and to profit from increased educational opportunity.

Local programs receiving funds under the Bilingual Instruction Act had to use two languages as media of instruction and employ teachers who had specialized in elementary education and received special training in bilingual education. An integral part of the instructional program was the history and culture associated with the students' mother tongue.

The State legislature did not provide funds for the Bilingual Instruction program in 1972-73; however, the program continued with $300,000 from the education budget designated for "special projects."

In 1973 the State legislature passed the Bilingual Multi-Cultural Education Act to "insure equal educational opportunity for students in New Mexico." The statute superseded Senate Bills 270 and 155. The law included five provisions with which local districts must comply to be eligible for State financial support. They are:

1. Provide for the educational needs of linguistically and culturally different students, including native American children, and other students who may wish to participate, in grades K to 6, with priority to be given to programs in grades K through 3.

2. Fund programs for culturally and linguistically different students in the State in grades K through 3 for which there is an identifiable need to improve the language capabilities of these students before funding programs at higher grade levels.

3. Use two languages as media of instruction for any part or all of the curriculum.

4. Use teachers who have specialized in elementary education and have received special training in bilingual education.

5. Emphasize the history and culture associated with the students' mother tongue.

The law defined as culturally and linguistically different "those persons who are of a different cultural background than the majority culture of the State and whose native tongue is of a language other than the language of the majority culture within the State."

A survey of New Mexico's public school population revealed that 49.2 percent of the students were Anglo-American, 40.7 percent were Spanish-surnamed, 7.7 percent were native Americans, 2.2 percent were blacks, and 0.2 percent were Oriental.

The Bilingual Multi-Cultural Education Act did not include any specific funding provisions. However, House Bill 300, the General Appropriations Bill, included $700,000 to implement the program in 1973-74 and $1 million for 1974-75. Sixty-six of New Mexico's 88 districts had State bilingual programs in 1974-75. They served 14,724 children, including 5,526 first graders, 4,824 second graders, 4,284 third graders, and 90 fourth graders.

A school district receives $308.25 for each full-time equivalent (FTE) student participating in the bilingual program. However, the FTE figure is based on the proportion of the approximately 360-minute school day during which a student receives foreign language instruction. Thus, if a

school district had 25 children receiving 60 minutes of bilingual instruction a day, the FTE rate would be 4.18 (60 ÷ 360 = .167; .167 X 25 = 4.18).

The objectives of programs financed under the Bilingual Multi-Cultural Education Act are:

1. Use of the cultural background of the students in implementing the program.

2. Inclusion of components to ensure affective development of the children's self-image,

3. Specific instruction to expand the language proficiency of the children in two languages.

Any school district may participate in the State program. All applications are reviewed by the State Department of Education.

New York

New York's State Education Department established an Office of Bilingual Education in 1969 for "the purpose of meeting the educational needs of children who have English language difficulty." However, it was not until 1973 that State funds became available to finance bilingual education.

The purpose of Chapter 720 of the Laws of 1973 was "to provide special State aid for locally administered programs for pupils of limited English-speaking ability because they come from environments where the dominant language is other than English." The law defined students of limited English-speaking ability as "students who have special educational needs because their dominant language is not English."

Under Chapter 720 local school districts must apply for bilingual education grants by July 1 of each year. The application must include the following information:

1. The number of pupils of limited English-speaking ability who will benefit from the program.

2. The nature of participants' special educational needs.

3. The specific goals of the programs in regard to a child's total development.

4. The qualifications of the professional and auxiliary staff involved in the program.

5. Indication that sufficient materials and equipment will be provided.

6. Description of how the program will be administered, supervised, and staffed, including long-range planning for the continuous progress of the children, inservice education, and parental involvement.

7. Provisions for continuing evaluation.

8. Proposed budget, including all funds to be used for the program, whether provided by Federal, State, or local government, other agencies, or private persons.

9. Description of the measures taken to ensure the involvement of the community in the development and operation of the program and to ensure the coordination of the program with other efforts to assist children of limited English-speaking ability.

10. Any other information required by the State Education Department.

Each school district receiving funds under Chapter 720 must establish a bilingual education advisory committee consisting primarily of "persons living within the community, having particular knowledge or experience relating to the educational needs of pupils of limited English-speaking ability."

In 1974-75, 20 school districts received bilingual education funds under Chapter 720. A total of $1.5 million was made available specifically for bilingual education in each of school years 1973-74 and 1974-75. In addition, school districts often earmarked a portion of their Urban Education funds (until June 1974) or Chapter 241 funds for bilingual education or instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL). A study of bilingual and ESL programs in New York in 1973-74 revealed that $3,749,974 in Urban Education funds were used for instruction in bilingual education, ESL, and related services.

In addition to the State funding, a number of school districts set aside portions of the general tax levy used for schools for bilingual education. As a result of litigation by ASPIRA, the Board of Education of the City of New York implemented a far-reaching bilingual education thrust in 1974-75. The elements of the basic program, to be fully implemented in September 1975, will be intensive instruction in English, instruction in Spanish in subject areas such as math, science, and social studies, and reinforcement of pupils' use of Spanish and their reading comprehension of Spanish. Pilot programs will get underway in February 1975. The program will be financed with $8 million from the general tax levy to be distributed to community school districts in proportion to the number of pupils whose dominant language is other than English.

Ohio

Ohio's State-financed compensatory education program, known as the Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF), began in 1967 with the passage of Senate Bill 350. It was designed "to improve the educational and cultural status of disadvantaged pupils."

DPPF, from its inception, was tied more closely to title I than most other State compensatory education programs. Like part of the title I eligibility formula, eligibility for DPPF is based on the number of children aged 5 to 17 in families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC); initially the State required a school district to have 100 AFDC children in order to receive DPPF funds, but an amendment to DPPF in 1971 reduced this figure to 50. Under the old formula, 131 school districts were eligible to receive DPPF grants; the number of eligible districts nearly doubled after the 1971 amendment. By fiscal year 1975, increased by the mobility of lower income families into rural and suburban areas, the number of eligible districts had risen to 405.

Guidelines developed by the State Department of Education for DPPF require that State compensatory education programs be conducted only in title I schools. Within the schools any child, whether or not his family is on AFDC or if he is receiving title I services, may participate in a DPPF program. However, the State requires that children with the greatest academic, emotional and health needs be given first consideration. The number of students receiving help under DPPF grew from 291,036 in the second semester of 1968, when DPPF first started, to 1,492,744 during the 1973-74 school year. Many of these children also received title I Or other types of compensatory services. Table 7 gives the number of children served and other data about DPPF from 1968 to 1974.

State law gradually raised the maximum per pupil allocation under DPPF. For fiscal year 1974 the maximum was $200; however, only $142 per pupil was actually allotted because the more than $33 million appropriation was not enough to provide full funding for all eligible students. The DPPF appropriation is expected to jump to $53 million in fiscal year 1975.

DPPF money can be used for a variety of purposes. As spelled out in the law, these include academic achievement and remedial programs, adaptation of curriculum or instructional methods, cultural enrichment experiences, dropout prevention, home-school and adult education programs, improvement of communication skills, improvement of health and related services, improvement of library services, motivational and self-imagery development, and safety and building security. Activities needed to implement such programs may include use of counselors; use of paraprofessionals; teacher and staff preservice and inservice training; learning kits; improvement of the pupil:teacher ratio; special tutoring, camp, farm, or environmental education; special classes for disruptive pupils; executive teacher plans; and use of security guards.

Table 7. Data on Ohio's Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund (DPPF)

Year	Eligible Districts	Participating Districts	Allocation Per Pupil	Program Participants	Payments to Districts
1968	131	130	$ 42	291,036	$4,335,911
68-69	131	129	84	692,465	8,773,548
69-70	129	127	150	842,462	16,472,335
70-71	130	130	175	1,159,249	22,254,431
71-72	255	259	175-200*	1,412,991	28,669,527
72-73	326	326	155	1,492,744	[illegible],843,658
73-74	384	384	142		33,337,400

*House Bill 475 set the DPPF per pupil allocation at $175 for five-twelfths of the year and $200 for seven-twelfths of the year.

Some examples of DPPF programs illustrate the different ways in which funds are used. Five inner city schools in Cincinnati participate in Project Outreach; teacher aides visit homes and, working with mothers, gather groups of 4 and 5-year-olds to "play." Learning materials include picture books, play dough, blocks, plastic farm animals, and so on. When the children are ready, they're invited to school for half a day. In Dayton DPPF funded differentiated staffing at the largest inner city school in the State; a master teacher worked with three to six teachers, a teacher intern, a team aide, a clerical aide, and volunteers to individualize instruction. Each team served 150 to 200 children in grades 1 through 4.

Like title I ESEA, DPPF guidelines require the use of coordinated planning, needs assessment, measurable goals, and parental involvement. The State Department of Education urges that "everyone directly affected by the school system--superintendents, central staff, boards of education, building principals, teachers and other professionals, paraprofessionals, students, parents, and residents of the community--be involved in assessment of needs, establishing of goals, and program planning." DPPF goals must be specific and measurable; both short and long-term goals must be developed for each program.

Evaluation requirements for DPPF programs are also very precise. Program evaluations must be submitted within 30 days following the close of the program. Fiscal reports are due no later than November 15 following the close of the fiscal year June 30. State Department of Education personnel continuously conduct on-site evaluations of DPPF projects. In fiscal year 1975 a title III ESEA grant funded an indepth study of the effects of DPPF on compensatory education in Ohio.

In addition to DPPF, a property tax relief program in Ohio, commonly referred to as the municipal overburden, returns approximately $23 million in State tax revenues annually to nine large cities; a legislative study indicated the cities paid more in taxes than was returned to them under the traditional formula. Eighteen smaller cities were added to the municipal overburden program in fiscal year 1975. The municipalities may use the extra revenue for a number of purposes, including education.

Oregon

In practice Oregon's State compensatory education program applies only to Portland. State statutes, passed in 1965, require that a school district have an average daily membership of 50,000 to qualify for disadvantaged funds; thus, Portland is the only eligible district.

The State appropriates $2 million for each fiscal biennium to enable Portland schools to provide additional services to disadvantaged children. State law defines disadvantaged children as "children who in their backgrounds are socially or culturally deprived to such a degree that without supplemental facilities and services they cannot profit in regular school programs to the same extent as children with normal backgrounds."

Portland uses the State disadvantaged funds in combination with Federal and local compensatory education funds to finance its Disadvantaged Child Project. The school district commits about $500,000 annually to compensatory education; this is used in conjunction with the $1 million in State compensatory education money and $900,000 of the district's approximately $2 million title I allocation.

The Disadvantaged Child Project generally follows title I guidelines. However, the project is more limited--it operates in only 10 of Portland's 27 title I schools. The ten participating schools are the most disadvantaged of these schools.

The Disadvantaged Child Project has established reading laboratories in several schools, equipped classrooms with a multiplicity of filmstrips, slides, transparencies, and tapes, instituted closed circuit television programs aimed at disadvantaged children, and expanded children's learning experiences through field trips and more diversified instruction. A variety of team teaching and staff differentiation techniques are used to effectively teach children; the 10 target schools employ 70 teacher aides and also utilize teacher interns and volunteers.

Four alternative programs are part of Portland's Disadvantaged Child Project. The Albina Youth Opportunity School gives dropouts a second chance. Emphasizing skill training as well as the traditional high school courses, the school has placed 200 students in work-study programs since 1968. Early Childhood Education Centers help preschool children from disadvantaged families develop learning skills; 450 3- and 4-year-olds attend nine centers 3 hours a day, 5 days a week. The Follow Through program serves children in kindergarten through third grade; approximately 500 graduates of Portland's early childhood education centers and 400 other children attend two Follow Through centers in the city. The fourth alternative program, the Administrative Transfer Program, is a voluntary busing program designed to give disadvantaged children an opportunity to attend school outside their neighborhood; nearly 1,700 students are bused to 42 Portland schools and four suburban districts.

The results of standardized tests in reading and mathematics indicate that students in the 10 target schools still achieve at a lower level than their peers; however, the difference in achievement levels has decreased since initiation of the Disadvantaged Child Project. If nothing else, the project stopped the downward trend of achievement levels.

Pennsylvania

Unlike most other State compensatory education programs, Pennsylvania's program has no relationship to title I. Begun in 1965, it was designed to provide a portion of a local school district's matching funds for Federal programs aimed at helping the disadvantaged.

Many of the Federal programs--such as Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Adult Basic Education, Follow Through, National Teacher Corps, Counselor Training, and Media Services--required that local school districts assume 20 percent of a project's total cost. Some Pennsylvania school districts found it impossible to raise the required funds for new programs. Thus, the State legislature has appropriated $1 million annually (except in 1967 when the appropriation was $500,000) to provide one-half of the matching requirement.

In 1973-74, 23 Pennsylvania school districts received portions of the $1 million appropriation. Table 8 indicates how the money was used to support various Federal programs. State funds could be used to provide a maximum of 10 percent of a project's total cost.

Table 8. Pennsylvania's Matching Funds for Federal Programs for the Disadvantaged: Fiscal Year 1973

Program	Number of Projects	State Funds	Federal Funds
Head Start	21	$673,014	$7,723,706
Adult Basic Education	13	93,519	841,203
Neighborhood Youth Corps	3	54,077	451,440
Follow Through	2	66,310	472,750
Manpower Development Training Act	2	42,995	386,954
National Teacher Corps	2	50,279	479,589
Counselor Training	1	12,620	113,580
Media Services	1	7,186	64,681
TOTALS	45	$1,000,000	$10,533,903

In addition to the compensatory education program providing matching funds, Pennsylvania has a program authorizing poverty payments of $140 per child to districts with high concentrations of children from low income families. The program began in 1966-67, with per child payments of $90 and was budgeted at $92 million in fiscal year 1973. In practice the poverty payments cannot be classified as a compensatory education program; although the allotment of funds is based on criteria similar to those in the title I formula, the program is not categorical. School districts may use the grants for any purpose, not just for compensatory education.

Pennsylvania has no specific legislation for bilingual education or State funds set aside specifically for that purpose. Nevertheless, the State has an extensive bilingual education program based on a mandate from the State Secretary of Education, issued in March 1972, which has the strength of law.

Curriculum regulations of the State Board of Education require school districts with non-English-speaking children to implement bilingual or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs using the per pupil funds allocated to each district from State tax levies. Districts are urged to supplement the bilingual programs with Federal funds available under titles I, III, and VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Of the 505 school districts in Pennsylvania, 110 reported non-English-dominant children during the 1973-74 school year; however, 10 districts had only one such child and 20 had only two children each. Twenty districts had between 30 and 700 non-English-dominant children, and one district had more than 8,000. State guidelines define the target population of bilingual and/or ESL programs as "those children whose dominant language is not English." A student in any one of the following six categories, based on his competency in English and in his native language, is to be included in bilingual or ESL programs:

1. A student who understands, speaks, reads, and writes his native language fluently but who does not understand, read, write, or speak any English.

2. A student who has limited understanding of spoken English but does not speak it.

3. A student who understands and speaks his native language but has limited or no ability to read and write it and who does not understand, speak, read, or write any English.

4. A student who understands and speaks English on a limited basis but is unable to read or write English.

5. A student who understands and speaks English fluently but who is unable to read or write English.

6. A student who apparently understands and speaks English but who encounters difficulty in comprehending the specialized language and concepts contained in the different subject matter areas.

More than 12,000 children with 52 languages and dialects participated in bilingual and ESL programs in Pennsylvania during 1973-74. More than 10,000 of the children spoke Spanish; the most widely spoken foreign languages after that were Italian, Greek, Korean, Portuguese, and Chinese in that order.

The purpose of Pennsylvania's bilingual education program is two-fold: "to provide for students whose dominant language is not English sound educational programs commensurate with their abilities, interests, and aspirations"; and "to provide for students whose dominant language is English programs that will permit them to become acquainted with the language, history, and culture of their non-English-dominant peers." State guidelines also include specific behavorial objectives for English and non-English-dominant children in grades K through 12. Long-term objectives for non-English-dominant students are an annual increase in the percentage of the target population who will complete high school, continue into postsecondary education, be admitted into vocational-technical programs, and/or be gainfully employed in diversified fields.

Because it is not unusual for a school district to have as few as 40 non-English-dominant children representing as many as 12 languages, the Revised Guidelines for Educational Programs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for Children Whose Dominant Language Is Not English gave local school districts the option of providing bilingual or ESL programs. However, the State encourages the development of bilingual programs:

> While these guidelines offer an option of ESL, it is the feeling of the Pennsylvania Department of Education that the bilingual approach is not only preferable, but also more closely in line with the rationale of the program and the department's commitment to the multicultural and multilingual American.

State guidelines also require the establishment of a program advisory committee, with parents of participating children comprising at least 50 percent of the members; individual student assessment; and annual program evaluation.

Rhode Island

The State Compensatory Education Act, Chapter 160, Section IV of the Public Laws of 1968--commonly referred to as Section 4--was enacted during the 1968 legislative session. It provides financial assistance in the amount of $2 million annually to school districts to initiate new compensatory education programs or to expand or supplement existing programs. The State Board of Regents requested a $4-million appropriation for compensatory education in fiscal year 1976.

Section 4 is closely tied to title I both administratively and operationally. The same State personnel (in the Office of Compensatory Education) and, usually, local school officials administer both programs. The State allots Section 4 money to local school districts based on a district's percentage of the total State title I appropriation. Thus, if a district received 8 percent of the available Section 4 funds.

For the purposes of Section 4, each school district must rank its public schools according to title I criteria. First priority must be given to schools already operating title I programs; State compensatory education funds may be used in these schools to supplement the title I project, to provide new services for disadvantaged children, or to continue a title I project if title I funds are transferred to another use. If a school district chooses, it may use Section 4 grants in schools eligible for title I which are not actually participating in the district's title I program; Section 4 projects in such schools should supplement existing, locally funded projects or initiate new services. However, if any new services are offered in such schools, the same services must be offered to eligible children in title I schools. Section 4 funds may be used in non-title I schools only after the needs of all children in title I eligible schools have been met.

The types of programs funded under Section 4 are similar to those funded under title I. They include such instructional activities as art, cultural enrichment, reading, English as a second language, speech, health and recreation, home economics, industrial arts, math, science, and preschool programs. Supportive services which must be funded are attendance, clothing, food, guidance and counseling, dental or medical care, library, psychological services, and transportation. In 1972-73, only 10.2 percent of Rhode Island's total title I expenditures were used for supportive services; 30.2 percent of the Section 4 expenditures were used for supportive services. More than 42 percent of the title I funds went for reading instruction; 23 percent of Section 4 money was used for the same purpose.

There were 86 compensatory education projects in Rhode Island during the 1972-73 school year. Of these, 40 used only title I money, 26 used only Section 4 money, and 20 were funded jointly. In the case of joint funding, State guidelines encourage local school districts to use Section 4 funds for supportive services. Nearly 4,700 children received help from both title I and Section 4; 12,881 from only Section 4; and 15,083 from only title I.

Applications and evaluation formats for both title I and Section 4 are identical. Guidelines are also similar, although Section 4 does not require parental involvement.

Bilingual Education Program

In May 1974 the Rhode Island legislature passed the State Transitional Bilingual Education Act as an amendment to the State's general laws on education. The act, which resembles Illinois' bilingual education legislation in purpose and definition, provides for the establishment of bilingual programs in public schools and reimbursement to school districts for the "extra costs" of such programs.

The law requires school districts to take an annual census of the number of children of limited English-speaking ability. Such children are

defined as those "whose native tongue is a language other than English and who have difficulty performing ordinary classwork in English." However, the Rhode Island law provides that if a parent disagrees with a school district's classification of the child, "the parent's judgment shall be conclusive." Establishment of a bilingual education program is mandatory for districts with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability in a single language classification.

Actual implementation of the State Transitional Bilingual Education Act was hampered by an amendment to the original bill which stipulated that the act would take effect "only when funds of the Federal government are made available and accepted by the State Department of Education to carry out the purposes of this act on a continuing basis." The interpretation of that clause has raised a number of questions. Do the funds available under title VII ESEA constitute a sufficient Federal commitment? Will the State appropriate any funds for bilingual education?

The law required the creation of a Division of Bilingual Education within the State Department of Education. The division has $50,000 for the 1974-75 school year to provide inservice training for bilingual education teachers. The State Department will request $1 million for bilingual education in fiscal year 1976.

Many of the provisions of the Rhode Island law are similar to those in other States, such as notification of parents of their children's participation, establishment of a parent advisory council, contents of the bilingual program, and criteria for teachers of bilingual education. Unlike other States, Rhode Island requires school districts implementing a bilingual education program to hire teacher aides, "provided that at least half the teachers' aides assigned to each program shall be native speakers of the language and share the culture of the children of limited English-speaking ability enrolled in the program." Each such school district must also hire a community coordinator. The community coordinators, according to the law, "shall seek to promote communication, understanding, and cooperation between the public schools and the community and shall visit the homes of children who are or could be enrolled in a bilingual program in order to convey information about the program." The law also indicates that children may participate in the program for up to 6 years, rather than the 3-year figure favored by most States.

Texas

Texas has had a statewide design for bilingual education since the late 1960's, but State legislation making bilingual education mandatory in school districts with a minimum number of children of limited English-speaking ability was not passed until June 1973. The law required districts with 20 or more children of limited English-speaking ability in one language classification at any grade level to implement a bilingual

education program at the 1st grade level in September 1974, adding one grade level each succeeding year until a bilingual program covers grades 1 through 6. The law also permits school districts to implement bilingual education programs at any grade level and in any language.

The State legislature appropriated $2.7 million for bilingual education during the 1973-75 biennium. The 1973-74 school year was used for planning, training teachers, selecting materials, and establishing guidelines. Monolingual teachers assigned to teach in bilingual education programs in 1974-75 took 5 weeks of intensive foreign language instruction in Spanish. Monolingual and bilingual teachers participated in a 1-week inservice training session, concentrating on the methods and materials of bilingual instruction and the cultures of children of limited English-speaking ability.

A statewide survey of bilingual education needs conducted by the Texas Education Agency in October 1973 showed there were 25,136 kindergarten and 27,707 1st grade students of limited English-speaking ability in the State, most of them Spanish-speaking. There were 1,004 bilingual teachers and 786 monolingual teachers who needed training to implement the State-required bilingual education program for 25,000 children in 1974-75.

State guidelines for bilingual education programs, Revisions in Administrative Procedures for the Implementation of Bilingual Education Programs, call for the inclusion of six instructional components:

1. The basic concepts initiating the child into the school environoment are taught in his home language.

2. Language development is provided in the child's dominant language.

3. Language development is provided in the child's second language.

4. Subject matter and concepts are taught in the child's dominant language.

5. Subject matter and concepts are taught in the child's second language.

6. Specific attention is given to develop in the child a positive identity with his cultural heritage, self-assurance, and confidence.

State law emphasizes the importance of English, while acknowledging the need for instruction in another language: "It is the policy of this State to insure the mastery of English by all pupils in the schools; provided that bilingual instruction may be offered in those situations when such instruction is necessary to insure their reasonable efficiency in the English language so as not to be educationally disadvantaged."

The law provides for a special per pupil allowance to local school districts for meeting the extra costs of bilingual education; such costs include "pupil evaluation, books, instructional media, and other supplies required for quality instruction." Transportation costs are also reimbursable.

Utah

The 1973 State legislature passed the Utah Compensatory Education Program as part of the general School Finance Program; it allotted $600,000 annually to provide programs for disadvantaged students. All school districts in the State are eligible to participate in the program.

The State Board of Education defines disadvantaged pupils as those who "achieve far below the level of the average for their age and grade when such failure to achieve is due to economic, social, cultural, linguistic, or other similar factors." The number of disadvantaged students in a district is determined by adding the number of pupils in the following categories:

1. Spanish-American students who have bilingual characteristics; i.e., they have a Spanish surname or a mother whose maiden name was Spanish and live in a home where Spanish is spoken.

2. American Indian students who have bilingual characteristics; i.e., they live in a home where an Indian tongue or dialect is spoken.

3. Other pupils who have bilingual characteristics; i.e., who live in homes where Japanese, German, etc., is spoken.

4. Pupils who come from low income families as determined by the free lunch count taken in May of each fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the compensatory education program is conducted.

5. Pupils living in foster homes, as determined by the Division of Family Services during the fiscal year preceding the funding year.

6. Pupils in families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children, as determined by the Division of Family Services, for the fiscal year preceding the funding year.

7. Neglected and delinquent children living in institutions within the school district, as recorded on the title I ESEA survey for each fiscal year preceding the funding year.

Each district in the State receives a proportionate share of the $600,000 available annually, based on the total number of children the district has in the above seven categories.

During the first year of the program, a school district receiving State compensatory education funds was required to use those funds for compensatory education. A 1974 amendment permitted school districts to combine State funds granted for teacher leadership, extended year, instructional media, career development, experimental community school, elementary guidance, and compensatory education programs. Use of the combined funds is now discretionary; a school district may use all the funds for a single program or operate projects in all categories.

Any school district planning a State-funded compensatory education program must identify all disadvantaged children in the district by name, set measurable objectives to be achieved by these pupils, and evaluate the effectiveness of the program. No evaluation of the State compensatory education program is yet available.

Washington

Washington has two compensatory education programs--the Culturally Disadvantaged Program and Urban, Rural, and Racial Disadvantaged (URRD) educational program. The Culturally Disadvantaged Program, begun in 1965, is a formula-based program increasing a school district's annual school apportionment from the State according to the number of disadvantaged children in each district. The URRD program is a competitive grant process begun in 1969.

URRD

URRD was a legislative response to the growing educational problems evident in Washington's three major urban areas--Seattle, Spokane, and Tacoma. It was designed to alleviate the following problems:

1. High dropout and absenteeism rates.
2. Low community support for schools.
3. Low level of vital communications between parents and schools, community and schools, students and school administration, and teachers and school administration.
4. High rate of vandalism and violence.
5. High rate of academic underachievement.
6. School districts' inability to accurately identify and remedy the underlying causes of the above problems.

During the first year of URRD, with an initial appropriation of $6,054,000 for the 1969-71 biennium, projects for the disadvantaged were concentrated in urban areas of the State. By 1971 URRD had expanded into rural areas. The program's definition of disadvantaged children is those "who have physically dropped out of the classroom before graduating or those who are psychological dropouts because of special personal needs resulting from poverty, neglect, delinquency, negative self-concept, and cultural, geographic, ethnic, or linguistic isolation."

URRD projects fall into one of five major categories--school reentry and motivation programs, preschool education, Indian education, academic achievement programs, and bilingual/bicultural education. There are also several subcategories. To be funded each project must have as its goal, with a target date of June 30, 1977, to increase by 20 percent the number of disadvantaged children in Washington who are attending and/or graduating from school with performance consistent with their potential. Baseline data used to establish a statewide needs assessment for the URRD program were tabulated in extensive demographic and socioeconomic profiles of Washington's congressional districts, based on 1970 Census data; the data are available in Population Profiles.

In addition to the statewide URRD goal, the Superintendent of Public Instruction specified categorical objectives for the 1973-75 biennium. These were:

1. Dropout programs--Alternative education projects for the retrieval and retention of students who are unable to succeed in the traditional school setting will effect a 10 to 15 percent reduction in the number of school-age children who are neither working nor attending school.

2. Early childhood education--Projects designed to develop positive self-concepts and to provide learning experiences to preschool and primary grade children will result in a 10 to 15 percent increase in their academic and social achievement.

3. Indian education--Projects designed to meet the educational needs of both reservation and nonreservation Indian children will effect a 5 to 12 percent increase in their academic and social achievement.

4. Community involvement--An 8 to 12 percent increase in parent/community involvement in school activities (as evidenced through active participation) will result from projects designed to increase parent and commmunity involvement in the educational process.

5. Tutoring--Projects designed to provide scholastic assistance before and after dropping out occurs will effect an 8 to 15 percent increase in the academic achievements of participating students.

6. Summer education--A 5 to 10 percent increase in both summer and regular school academic achievement will result from projects designed to provide educational summer experiences.

7. Bilingual education--Projects designed to meet the bilingual educational needs of children will increase by 8 to 15 percent the academic achievement and occupational awareness of children who participate.

In addition to supporting the basic URRD goal and one of the seven categorical objectives outlined above, each URRD project must establish an advisory committee, provide inservice training for staff members, present objectives in measurable terms, relate objectives to needs, and present evidence that the project treats high priority educational needs of the target population.

In 1972-73, the last year for which complete data were available, Washington approved 36 URRD projects using $4,568,372 in URRD funds, $1,192,484 in district and in-kind funds, and $2,004,206 in other local, State, and Federal funds. Table 9 indicates the types of projects funded, the number of participating children, and funding levels. With an appropriation of $9,247,800 for the 1973-75 biennium, the State funded 46 URRD projects, 32 of them continuing projects which were renewed after operating for 2 or more consecutive years.

A statewide evaluation of the 1972-73 URRD projects indicated the projects used a total of 403 performance objectives; by the end of the school year, 102 (25.3 percent) of these objectives had been exceeded, 211 (52.4 percent) had been met, and 78 (19.3 percent) partially met.

A more extensive evaluation of the 32 1973-74 continuation projects was conducted by the Audit and Evaluation Section of the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory (NWREL), under contract to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The evaluation concentrated on four issues affecting each project--needs justification, community involvement, project objectives, and verification of the 1972-73 evaluation report. The NWREL's findings were:

1. Needs justification--All projects attempted to address between 2 and 11 needs. In two projects evaluators could not detect any direct evidence substantiating the stated needs; in six projects, needs were identified solely on the basis of staff judgments. Only seven projects relied totally on empirical data in substantiating needs; eight other projects relied substantially on empirical studies.

2. Community involvement--Although community involvement is a high priority of the URRD program and districts are required to form community advisory committees, evaluators found that in nine projects there was no evidence of such a committee or that the committee met infrequently. Eleven projects involved the community intensively.

Table 9. Data on 1972-73 URRD Projects, by Category*

Project	Total Funding	URRD Funds	District Funds	Other Funds	Number of Participants	Per Pupil
Dropout	$1,283,633	$767,876	$285,460	$230,297	1,104	$1,163
Early Childhood Education	1,931,408	706,374	627,605	597,429	1,677	1,152
Day Care	1,144,042	765,185	6,100	372,757	872	1,312
Community Involvement	2,572,745	1,738,575	204,981	629,189	43,498	52
Indian Education	438,220	242,362	52,116	143,742	1,826	240
Tutoring	178,614	147,000	822	30,792	865	207
Summer Education	202,400	188,000	14,400	--	5,332	38
Health Care**	14,000	13,000	1,000	--	1,785	8
TOTALS	$7,765,062	$4,568,372	$1,192,484	$2,004,206	56,959	$136***

*There are now five major categories with subcategories which include some of these services.

**Eliminated as a URRD priority in 1973-74.

***Average per pupil expenditure.

3. Project objectives--All projects had some objectives directly related to URRD's seven categorical objectives stated previously; however, a third of the projects also included objectives not related to URRD priorities. Health care, which was formerly a URRD objective, was still included in the objectives of six projects. Nineteen projects had objectives which were not defined in ways to make them measurable. At least four projects had no measurable objectives.

4. Verification of 1972-73 evaluation--Evaluators found data were available at the majority of sites to substantiate claims made in the project's 1972-73 evaluation report.

Culturally Disadvantaged Program

Washington's Culturally Disadvantaged Program began in 1965 with an expenditure of $658,512. It was designed to provide local school districts with extra funds, above the usual per pupil amount allotted to each district, to provide programs for "culturally disadvantaged" children. Initially the amount available to each district was computed by multiplying the number of children eligible for title I by 0.25, then by 0.1, and multiplying that product by the State's per pupil allocation; in other words, an extra 2.5 percent of the usual per pupil expenditure was available for each identified disadvantaged child. In 1973 the State legislature amended the school apportionment formula, making the weighting factor 10 percent (rather than 0.25) and making the number of children eligible for the free and reduced-price lunch program the determining factor in computing the number of disadvantaged children in each school district. In 1974-75 districts which applied for funds under the Culturally Disadvantaged Program received $39.40 (10 percent of the guaranteed $394 per pupil allotment) for each child eligible for the free and reduced-price lunch program.

Program funds must be used exclusively for projects designed to meet the educational needs of disadvantaged children. State guidelines specifically prohibit the use of program funds for noneducational costs such as student activity expenses and hot-lunch fees. Projects may operate in title I or non-title I schools, so long as disadvantaged children are served.

Wisconsin

Wisconsin's Special Educational Needs (SEN) program is the newest of existing State compensatory education programs. It was started during the second semester of the 1973-74 school year, with a small initial appropriation of $600,000. When the legislature created the program in 1973, it authorized an appropriation of $6 million for the 1973-75 biennium. However, legislative and administrative reservations resulted in the release of only $3.5 million: $600,000 in 1973 and $2.9 million in 1974.

Legislators agreed to limit the funding to establish experimental programs rather than spend money to reach the largest number of pupils immediately.

SEN was designed to encourage both public school districts and nonprofit, nonsectarian agencies to develop programs to meet special educational needs of children from preschool (age 3) through secondary school. According to the law, pupils are eligible if they have or are likely to have low levels of academic achievement, especially if related to social and/or economic factors. The law specified that priority be given to preschool and primary grade children.

According to the State Department of Public Instruction, the major goal of each local SEN program should be "to provide a learning situation that is inherently stimulating and self-perpetuating and that is individually relevant to each child participating in the program." The State urged school districts to make three activity commitments in planning SEN projects:

1. Know what motivates the child and capture his curiosity in order to effectively stimulate a child to learn.

2. Develop vital and personal relevant educational programs based on the needs of individual children.

3. Select educational materials and methods which recognize individual learning variations.

In order to receive funds for an SEN program, a school district must establish a local advisory program council to assist in the identification of children's needs and the development of the project and prove that it has an adequate accounting and management capacity. In reviewing an SEN project application, the State Department of Public Instruction considers the following factors:

1. A local advisory program council must be involved in the planning and development of the project.

2. The project must concern itself with the diagnosed causes of underachievement and not the superficial manifestations of an achievement related problem.

3. The project must deal with a problem related to academic achievement--the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains.

4. Programs must relate to the social and economic factors affecting participants.

5. Project evaluation must address itself to stated goals and objectives.

6. No conflict of interest may exist between other State and Federal programs.

7. The budget must reflect the stated goals and objectives of the program.

8. The budget must be efficient and reasonable.

9. The school district's budgeting and fiscal procedures must ensure accurate and current accounting records.

10. A licensed auditor must audit school and agency accounts.

11. The SEN project must supplement and not supplant an existing program.

Many SEN programs are funded jointly by the State and Federal programs, including title I ESEA, Head Start, and the Emergency School Aid Act. The State established specific guidelines for the joint use of SEN and title I funds. They are:

1. SEN funds may be used for pupils in programs which are similar or dissimilar to title I programs in any selected school if the grade span differs from the grade span covered in the title I schools.

2. SEN funds may be used to pick up additional title I eligible pupils who are not currently served under title I; however, such students must attend title I target schools.

3. SEN funds may be used exclusively for title I students in target schools to supplement needed services.

4. If SEN funds are to be used in any school other than a title I target school in similar grade spans, the school district must also offer the same SEN program, which must differ from the title I program, to title I pupils who meet SEN eligiblity requirements.

In identifying SEN eligible students, the primary criterion is low academic achievement. In addition, 75 percent of the participants must be identified by both economic and social factors; 25 percent may be identified by either social or economic criteria.

In addition to the Special Educational Needs program, Wisconsin has provided direct aid to Milwaukee schools to meet critical educational needs in inner city schools. The legislature authorized $4,750,000 for the direct aids; it funded two projects in Milwuakee--Interrelated Language Skills Centers and the Teacher Aide Program.

The Interrelated Language Skills Centers began operation in September 1968 as a joint effort of a community group, staff members of the Milwaukee Public Schools, university personnel, and the Milwaukee Teacher Education Association. The centers are designed to meet the learning needs of academically retarded children in grades 4 to 8 at title I schools.

The Teacher Aide Program enabled 46 Milwaukee schools to hire aides to assist in three basic functions--activities directly related to the learning process, activities which relieve the teacher of noninstructional tasks, and activities which provide a link between home and community.

3. EXPIRED PROGRAMS

Three States--Colorado, Delaware, and New York--had State-financed compensatory education programs which lapsed during the early or mid-1970's. This chapter examines the history of the expired programs and the reasons for their expiration.

Colorado

Colorado's State compensatory education program, known as the Educational Achievement Act of Colorado (EAAC), was enacted in the spring of 1969. It ceased operation on June 30, 1973, for lack of appropriation.

In 1969 the State legislature saw a need to improve reading instruction for all underachieving students in Colorado; it was estimated that between 10 and 20 percent of the State's 540,000 students had reading difficulties. However, the legislature was unwilling to finance a total educational program, and the initial legislation included the term "pilot projects."

The law was designed to "assist certain local school districts to carry out programs for educational achievement of those students in grades 1 through 6 who are below their assigned grade in reading" by the following margins:

-- 0.3 in first grade

-- 0.6 in second grade

-- 0.9 in third grade

-- 1.2 in fourth grade

-- 1.5 in fifth grade

-- 1.8 in sixth grade

-- 2.0 or more in grades 7 to 12

EAAC grants were awarded to local school districts on a competitive basis; the total amount of funds available for each year was $2 million in 1969-70, $1,547,000 in 1970-71, $1 million in 1971-72, and $1 million in 1972-73.

Within the constraints that program emphasis must be on reading and that participants must exhibit the achievement deficits listed above, local districts had substantial freedom to devise their own projects. Total cost of the program was not to exceed $250 per pupil; a study of the 21 EAAC projects funded during the last year of the program, 1972-73, indicated that per pupil costs ranged from $25.95 (for a program which concentrated on inservice training of teachers) to $227.48.

The experimental nature of EAAC was at least hinted at in the program guidelines. These indicated that each district receiving an EAAC grant must report on the condition of the project for a period of 2 years after State funds were withdrawn; thus, the State funds were apparently meant as seed money, not as a continuing source of revenue for reading projects.

A bill was prepared in 1973 to correct some of the deficiencies of the EAAC program; it simplified the eligibility requirements for participants, required long-range planning by districts, and required that local districts assume at least 25 percent of a project's cost. The bill passed the State Senate but was never reported out of the House Education Committee. Since the bill never reached the floor of the house, no action was taken on either the EAAC amendments or an appropriation. The program died.

The success of EAAC projects was impossible to document during the first 3 years of the program; the variety of test instruments used, the lack of a common time interval for testing, and a lack of control over program costs made statewide conclusions impossible. Many individual projects exhibited signs of success. More precise evaluation requirements, including common pre- and post-tests and approximately the same testing dates for all projects, yielded some valid data for the 1972-73 school year. An analysis of the test results indicated that during the 6 to 7 months between the pre- and post-test, students gained from 7 to 12 months in reading achievement. This was a significant increase because, at the time of the pretesting, the students had been averaging 6 to 8 months gain per year.

Delaware

The legislation creating Delaware's State-financed compensatory education program in 1969 made it obvious that the program was experimental in nature and would be funded for only 3 years. Senate Bill 171 provided a supplementary appropriation of $1.5 million (for a 3-year period) "for an experimental program in certain public schools where a significant portion of the student population have been found to be two or more years below national grade achievement levels."

The law stipulated that Wilmington, Delaware's largest city, receive $300,000 of the $500,000 available annually; the remaining money was to be allocated to other districts. Six other districts--Appoquinimink, De La Warr, Indian River, Milford, Smyrna, and Capital--received grants. Each district had to establish an experimental program for underachieving children in grades 3 through 9 and provide control groups to facilitate evaluation at the end of 3 years.

The Appoquinimink program had two purposes--to see if the achievement level of educationally disadvantaged students could be significantly raised by (1) the use of a full-time mathematics specialist working with both students and teachers and (2) the use of additional full-time classroom teachers primarily concerned with the teaching of reading. After 3 years,

evaluators found that no statistically significant difference existed between the math achievement level of the approximately 100 students who had the services of the math specialist and the 75 control students. It was also found that no statistically significant difference in reading achievement existed between the 60 pupils in small classes compared with the 58 students in regular sized classes.

The De La Warr experimental project tested the use of a full-time classroom aide, a half-time corrective teacher, or both a full-time aide and a half-time corrective teacher on the achievement levels of students. The evaluation indicated that the reduction in the pupil:adult ratio in the classroom had no differential benefit in reading, spelling, or math achievement. The Smyrna project also tested reductions in pupil:adult ratios with similar results.

The evaluation of Indian River's Oral Language Project indicated that the use of classroom aides did not significantly improve participants' reading achievement, but it did improve their oral language facility. All 11 experimental groups showed higher total language scores than the corresponding control groups.

Milford's experimental project tested the effect of regular counseling of students and parents on student achievement levels. Test results showed no significant difference between experimental and control groups.

A visiting nurse to provide supportive services and a classroom aide to provide instructional services made no difference in the achievement levels of students participating in Capital's experimental program.

The Wilmington experimental program included three components--elementary school counseling services, the use of teacher aides to reduce pupil: adult ratios in the classroom, and a concentrated emphasis on study skills in grades 4 through 6. Although evaluation of the counseling program after the first year indicated no significant differences in the achievement levels of participating students, testing at the end of the 3-year period revealed the experimental group improved substantially in reading, language, arithmetic, and total achievement, compared with the control group. Results of the teacher aide and study skills components were less positive. Evaluation of the teacher aide program over the 3-year period yielded inconsistent results; in some instances differences favored the experimental group, in others the control group. The study skills program was not significantly effective as measured by results of the California Achievement Test.

Thus, Delaware's experimental compensatory education program had few positive results in terms of standardized test data.

New York

New York's Urban Education Program, which expired June 30, 1974, was one of the largest State-financed compensatory education programs, with an annual appropriation of $47 million or more. The program, which began in 1968, was designed to assist urban school districts "having a heavy concentration of pupils with special educational needs associated with poverty."

Urban Education was a formula grant program. To qualify for funding, a district had to have a weighted average daily attendance of at least 4,500, and at least 5 percent of the district's school-age children had to come from families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. In addition, the product of a district's weighted average daily attendance multiplied by the number of 6th grade students in the district scoring at or below the 24th percentile on New York State's reading test had to be 1,100 or more. Thus, only urban areas with large poverty pockets qualified for funding.

The appropriation for the first 3 years of the program was $52 million. For the next three fiscal years, 1972, 1973, and 1974, the appropriation was $47 million. New York City districts received more than 50 percent of the total amount available.

State guidelines required that school districts concentrate on pupils' needs in reading, mathematics, and bilingual education in planning their urban education program. Students in grades 1 to 6 were to receive first priority for participation.

Other guidelines for the Urban Education Program resembled title I regulations, except there was no provision for the involvement of children attending nonpublic schools.

The Urban Education Program was replaced in fiscal year 1975 by an additional operating aid granted to school districts on the basis of children with special educational needs. The new program is not limited to urban areas and does not use poverty criteria for determining eligible districts or children; it is discussed in detail in the next chapter.

4. ANTICIPATED PROGRAMS

Four States passed laws in late 1973 or early 1974 authorizing new compensatory education programs. They were Georgia, Maryland, New York, and Virginia.

Georgia

Early in 1974, the Georgia State legislature passed a comprehensive educational act which included an Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG) to take effect July 1, 1975. Section 6 of APEG, if funded in 1975, will provide compensatory educational services for disadvantaged children beginning in September 1975.

Maryland

The Maryland legislature passed legislation authorizing a statewide compensatory education program in 1973. The new State program will extend to the State's 23 counties the financial support for compensatory education which Baltimore City currently receives under the Density Aid program discussed in chapter 2; the statewide program will also supplement Baltimore's Density Aid program.

Although the legislation was passed in 1973, the legislature did not budget any money for the program. The State Department of Education in a study of compensatory education in Maryland found that more than 245,000 children between the ages of 3 and 17 were disadvantaged; 140,000 disadvantaged children did not participate in any compensatory education program.

The State Department of Education estimated that, using a per pupil expenditure of $300 to $400, it would cost approximately $42 to $56 million to provide services to all the disadvantaged children not currently served. Such an appropriation would be unrealistic; the State Department therefore requested $10 million to fund the State program for fiscal year 1976.

The State legislature defined a disadvantaged youth as one "who, because of environmental conditions, is not achieving scholastically commensurate with his abilities and who must compensate for inability to profit from the normal educational program." The State requires local school districts to design programs for students between the ages of 3 and 18 who are subject to language, cultural, and/or economic disadvantages but who are capable of completing the regular school program.

The legislation, Sections 106 A - C of Article 77, authorized the State Board of Education to establish three types of State compensatory education programs. They are:

1. New or modified teacher training curricula designed to enable teachers effectively to identify and teach disadvantaged children.

2. Research and consultative projects to assist State and local public agencies in creating compensatory education projects.

3. Evaluation, dissemination, and demonstration of compensatory education findings.

Local projects financed under Article 77 must meet the following goals:

1. Teach disadvantaged children to read.

2. Stimulate children's interest in learning.

3. Give children a sense of success in school.

4. Help children view their school experiences positively as a means of deterring droupouts.

State guidelines require each local school district to develop a comprehensive compensatory education program, based on a needs assessment and utilizing both State and Federal funds. Thus, Article 77 and title I ESEA projects must be closely coordinated. State guidelines are expected to resemble title I guidelines in many ways.

New York

On March 5, 1974, the New York State legislature eliminated the State's categorical Urban Education Program (discussed in the previous chapter), replacing it with increased funding for special categories of students. Under the new law, school districts will receive additional allotments for students with special educational needs, handicapped students, summer session pupils, and evening session pupils. The allotments for students with special educational needs constitutes New York's State-financed compensatory education program.

To determine the number of students with special educational needs a district must determine the number of 6th grade pupils who scored below the 24th percentile on the reading and math tests of New York's Pupil Evaluation tests for the 1971-72 and 1972-73 school years. This number is divided by the number of 6th grade students who took the tests; the resulting percentage is multiplied by the district's total public school enrollment to determine the number of students with special educational needs.

The money must be used to help educationally disadvantaged students. Although the allocation was based on 6th grade achievement levels, all students 2 or more years below grade level in math or reading (or, in the lower grades, students whose readiness levels indicate they will fall that far behind without special help) may receive services.

Guidelines for the new program are similar to those used for the defunct Urban Education Program. Districts are expected to concentrate on reading, math, and bilingual instruction; priority is to be given to children in grades 1 through 6. No funds may be used for preschool or adult education programs.

Virginia

Virginia's compensatory education program is a pilot effort designed to provide supplemental skills instruction in math and reading to under-achieving 5th and 6th grade students.

School districts participating in the program will receive $300 for each 4th grader who scored at or below the 12th percentile on the SRA (Science Research Associates) reading tests at the end of the 1972-73 school year. For the 1974-75 school year only those 5th graders who, as 4th graders, scored below the 50th percentile on the SRA tests may participate in the demonstration projects.

Project participants must be selected according to the following guidelines:

1. Forty percent of the participants must be 5th graders who, as 4th graders, scored at or below the 12th percentile on the SRA test in reading.

2. Thirty percent of the participants must be 5th graders who, as 4th graders, scored between the 13th and 25th percentile on the SRA test.

3. Thirty percent of the participants must be 5th graders who, as 4th graders, scored between the 26th and 49th percentile on the SRA test.

4. Students will be selected on the basis of disparity between the Short Test of Educational Ability (STEA) score and the SRA score in reading; students with the greatest disparity in scores will be given priority for participation.

5. Students in the math demonstration projects must be below the 49th percentile on the SRA math test. Participants will be chosen based on the disparity between STEA and SRA math scores.

The legislature appropriated $5,163,000 to serve a maximum of 17,210 underachieving 5th graders during the 1974-75 school year. An additional allocation of $9,293,400 was authorized to provide services for a maximum of 30,978 5th and 6th grade students during the 1975-76 school year.

DIRECTORY

Below is a directory of the persons responsible for the administration of the State-financed compensatory education programs discussed in this report.

Ongoing Programs

California:

(Title I, ESEA program)
Manuel V. Ceja
Assistant Superintendent of Public
Instruction for Compensatory Education
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, Calif. 95814
(916) 445-2590

(Bilingual program)
Gilbert T. Martinez
Manager, Bilingual-Bicultural Task Force
State Education Building
721 Capitol Mall, Room 423
Sacramento, Calif. 95814
(916) 445-2872

Connecticut:

Dr. Wallace Roby
State Act for Disadvantaged Children Coordinator
Bureau of Evaluation and Educational Services
State Department of Education
Box 2219
Hartford, Conn. 06115
(203) 566-3826

Florida:

(Title I, ESEA program)
Halley B. Lewis, Jr.
Administrator, Compensatory Education
State Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 32304
(904) 488-3575

(Bilingual program)
Mrs. Kittie Mae Taylor
Language Arts Consultant
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Fla. 32304
(904) 488-1707

Hawaii:	Ms. Rose Yamada Administrator, Compensatory Education State Department of Education P.O. Box 2360 Honolulu, Hawaii 96804 8-415-556-0220 (Ask operator for Honolulu number 548-2211)
Illinois:	H. Ned Seelye Department of Transitional Bilingual Education Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction 188 W. Randolph Chicago, Ill. 60601 (312) 793-3850
Louisiana:	Homer Dyess Coordinator, Foreign Languages and Bilingual Education Foreign Languages Section State Department of Education Baton Rouge, La. 70804 (504) 389-6486
Maryland:	George Lizby Division of Compensatory and Urban Programs P.O. Box 8717 Baltimore-Washington International Airport Baltimore, Md. 21240 (301) 796-8300 ext. 796
Massachusetts:	Ernest J. Mazzone Bureau of Transitional Bilingual Education Department of Education 182 Tremont Street Boston, Mass. 02111 (615) 727-8300
Michigan:	Clarence Wills Coordinator, Section 3 Program Compensatory Education Services Michigan Department of Education P.O. Box 420 Lansing, Mich. 48902 (517) 373-3921 Michael T. York Educational Consultant Section 48 Program Michigan Department of Education P.O. Box 420 Lansing, Mich. 48902 (517) 373-3921

New Jersey:

Dr. Jerome B. Jones
Coordinator of Title I, ESEA
State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-5830

New Mexico:

Henry W. Pascual
Director, Cross-Cultural Education
State Department of Education
Education Building
Capitol Complex
Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87501
(505) 827-5391

New York:

Carlos Perez
Supervisor, Bilingual Education Unit
State Department of Education
Room 761
Albany, New York 12223
(518) 474-8223

Ohio:

Robert O. Greer
Assistant Superintendent for Urban Education
State Department of Education
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 466-5834

Oregon:

Maurice Caba
Intergovernmental Specialist
Portland Public Schools
631 Northeast Clackamas Street
Portland, Oreg. 97208
(503) 234-3392

Pennsylvania:

(Title I, ESEA program)
Kenneth Schmelzlen
Division of Compensatory Programs
State Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126
(717) 787-7135

(Bilingual program)
Fannetta N. Gordon
Senior Program Advisory, Languages
Division of Arts and Hamanities
Bureau of Curriculum Services
Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17125
(717) 787-7098

Rhode Island:

Edward Costa
State Department of Education
Roger Williams Building
Hayes Street
Providence, R.I. 02908
(401) 277-2691

Texas:

Ernesto Zamora
Consultant
Office of International and Bilingual Education
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th St.
Austin, Tex. 78701
(512) 475-3651

Dr. Arturo Luis Gutierrez
Director of Special Programs
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th St.
Austin, Tex. 78701

Utah:

G. Morris Rowley
Administrator, Division of General Education
Utah State Board of Education
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 328-5061

Washington:

Walter E. Barbee
Supervisor, URRD Program
Grants Management Section
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Wash. 98504
(206) 753-3220

Warren H. Burton
Director of Equal Educational Opportunity
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Wash. 98504
(206) 753-2560

Wisconsin:

John P. Lawrence
Administrator, SEN Programs
Division of Instructional Services
State Department of Public Instruction
Wisconsin Hall
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wis. 53702
(608) 266-2699

Expired Programs

Colorado:
Robert Cheuvront
Consultant, Compensatory Education Services Unit
Colorado Department of Education
State Office Building
201 E. Colfax
Denver, Colo. 80203
(303) 892-2212

Delaware:
Donald H. Wachter
Director of Instruction
Department of Public Instruction
The Townsend Building
Dover, Del. 19901
(302) 678-4667

New York:
John L. House
Division of Urban Education
State Education Department
Albany, N.Y. 12224
(518) 474-1321

Anticipated Programs

Georgia:
Robert Beemon
Director of Compensatory Education
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Ga. 30334
(404) 656-2336

Maryland:
Larry Chamblin
Specialist, Federal Reports
Box 8717
Baltimore-Washington International Airport
Baltimore, Md. 21240
(301) 796-8300 ext. 244

New York:
John L. House
Division of Urban Education
State Education Department
Albany, N.Y. 12224
(518) 474-1321

Virginia:
Bernard R. Taylor
Director, Division of Elementary Education
State Department of Education
Richmond, Va. 23216
(804) 770-2676